United Nations S/PV.7740

Security Council

Seventy-first year

Provisional

7740th meeting
Tuesday, 19 July 2016, 10 a.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Bessho	(Japan)
Members:	Angola	Mr. Lucas
	China	Mr. Liu Jieyi
	Egypt	Mr. Aboulatta
	France	Mr. Delattre
	Malaysia	Mrs. Adnin
	New Zealand	Mr. Van Bohemen
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	Senegal	Mr. Seck
	Spain	Mr. Gasso Matoses
	Ukraine	Mr. Yelchenko
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Rycroft
	United States of America	Ms. Sison
	Uruguay	Mr. Rosselli
	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Mr. Suárez Moreno

Agenda

Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)

Security Council working methods

Letter dated 1 July 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2016/585)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council. Corrections* should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org).

16-22488 (E)

Accessible document Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)

Security Council working methods

Letter dated 1 July 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2016/585)

The President: In accordance with rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Singapore, South Africa, Switzerland and Turkey to participate in this meeting.

I propose that the Council invite the Permanent Observer of the Observer State of the Holy See to the United Nations to participate in this meeting, in accordance with the provisional rules of procedure and the previous practice in this regard.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2016/585, which contains a letter dated 1 July 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, transmitting a concept paper on the item under consideration.

All speakers, Council members and non-Council members alike, are asked to kindly keep their interventions succinct and within four minutes. Speakers who wish to do so may circulate the text of a more detailed statement to Council members and participants, without making oral statements that exceed four minutes. The microphone light will start blinking at the 3-minute, 30-second mark. At the 4-minute, 30-second mark, the President will urge speakers to kindly wrap-up immediately, as necessary. I would like to appeal to speakers to deliver their statements at a reasonable speed so that interpretation may be provided accurately.

I wish to inform all concerned that this open debate will be suspended during the lunch hour.

I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Japan.

Let me begin by expressing my sincere appreciation to all the Member States that are participating in what I believe to be an important and timely open debate to share their valuable views. I should like to take the floor first so that I can provide the broad context of this debate.

The Security Council's working methods are crucial to its ability to fulfil its responsibility to act promptly and effectively on behalf of international peace and security. That is why Japan has attached great importance to codifying, improving and implementing the working methods of the Council. In 2006, the first note 507 by the President of the Security Council (S/2006/507) was compiled. It set forth clearly the Council's practices at the time to enhance the transparency, efficiency and inclusiveness of its working methods. Today marks the tenth anniversary of the adoption of that note.

Over the past decade, the Security Council has made further progress in codifying and improving its working methods, most notably in the form of the revised note 507 of 2010 (S/2010/507). We are pleased with much of the positive feedback on the note 507 as a useful handbook, particularly for newly elected members. Yet, it is important for the Council to review the progress periodically and make necessary adjustments. In the coming months, the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters intends to work towards a revised note 507. Some measures may need to be revisisted and adjusted; some others may need further efforts for enhanced implementation. Decisions contained in a number of separate additional notes may need to be consolidated and streamlined.

I have convened this open debate today because I thought that the Council would benefit greatly from listening closely to the views of the wider United Nations membership, in addition to accumulating best practices within the Council. That is not to say that the Council has not made progress. Let me refer to some concrete examples.

To take full advantage of the elections of the non-permanent members being carried out from this

year on, Japan as Chair of the Informal Working Group has proposed that the Working Group revisit the transitional arrangements for the newly elected members of the Council. I am delighted to draw attention to the fact that, after intensive discussions, on 15 July the Council adopted the new presidential note S/2016/619, which makes improvements to the transitional arrangements. Within that note, the newly elected members are now invited to observe the Council's meetings from 1 October. The process for selecting the Chairs of subsidiary organs will be carried out in a more transparent and inclusive manner. I am convinced that this will benefit not only the newly elected members by helping them to prepare more efficiently, but also the Council as a whole by allowing it to function much more effectively right from the beginning of the year.

Enhancing transparency is another area in which, although it may not be fully satisfactory to the wider membership, the Security Council has made consistent efforts in recent years. As President of the Security Council, I have been conducting a press stake-out after every session of informal consultations, though there is a limit to the contents that I can share. I also welcome the holding of informal wrap-up briefing sessions, which have become a regular practice in recent years. In an effort to continue and build upon that good practice, on 29 July I will hold an informal wrap-up briefing session with the participation of several other Council members as briefers. I look forward to seeing many Council members, as well as non-Council members there.

The participation of many Member States in today's debate reflects the strong interest of the wider membership. The voices of all States Members of the United Nations are valuable in making the Council more effective. As Chair of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters, I intend to listen to them closely and will follow up on their specific, practical suggestions in the process of revising note 507.

I should like to conclude my remarks by stating that improving working methods is not the end of the story. An enlarged Security Council that reflects the geopolitical realities of the twenty-first century could be more effective in dealing with the unprecedented challenges we face today. Japan will continue to work with all Member States towards that goal.

I resume my functions as President of the Council.

I now give the floor to the other members of the Security Council.

Mr. Aboulatta (Egypt): I have the honour to deliver this joint statement on behalf of the three African members of the Security Council: Angola, Senegal and my country, Egypt. I would like to begin by making two generals remarks.

First, today's open debate bears testimony to the genuine interest of all United Nations Member States in enhancing the transparency, inclusivity and openness of the Security Council's work so as to ensure that it truly acts on behalf of the entire membership, in accordance with Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations. Secondly, Security Council members shall take advantage of the several notes and improvements that have been agreed over the past years. My joint statement today is one further step taken the three African members of the Security Council in that direction.

While there is a need for additional improvements in many aspects of the Security Council working methods, this statement will focus only on three key areas where our collective efforts are most needed, as requested by the President of the Council. The first area is the preparation of the Council's outcomes or the so-called penholdership, and in that regard I would like to stress the following.

The work of the Council is a collective responsibility. It is fundamental to ensure the equal participation and contribution of all Council members, permanent and elected, in the conduct of activities and the formulation of outcomes as penholders. In May, five elected members, in a unique exercise, jointly drafted a resolution and conducted extensive consultations with other Council members and all relevant stakeholders, leading to the unanimous adoption of resolution 2286 (2016), the first of its kind, on the protection of medical personnel. This indeed demonstrated the benefits of collective work in enhancing the credibility of Council's decisions. In that connection, we believe that the Chairs of the sanctions committees, who acquire considerable expertise on the country situations with which their respective committees are concerned, are particularly well positioned as co-penholders to contribute to the drafting of relevant Security Council outcomes.

This leads to our second area of focus, which is the work of the Security Council's subsidiary organs. In that regard, we welcome the recent adoption of the President's note S/2016/170, which, among other things,

enhances the transparency of the consultation process through which the new Chairs of the subsidiary organs are selected, and enables the newly elected members to be prepared to assume their responsibilities.

As a considerable amount of the Council's work takes place in its subsidiary bodies, the need for greater transparency is self-evident. One example is the need to allow the country to which the sanctions regime is applied more timely access to the reports of the panels of experts and other documents of the sanctions committees, especially in light of the fact that that country is the most concerned with those documents. We encourage the Chairs of the sanctions committee to continue to conduct field visits in order to better engage with countries under sanctions and countries of the relevant region, as well others stakeholders.

The third and last area is the engagement between the Council and other relevant stakeholders. We stand firm in favour of a more robust engagement with the wider United Nations membership, including and foremost those countries particularly affected by a particular situation under consideration, as well as troop- and police-contributing countries. We also stress the need for practical and more meaningful partnerships with regional and subregional organizations, particularly the African Union (AU), not only in managing conflicts but more importantly in preventing them. The Security Council should build upon the two informal dialogues held this year with the AU Peace and Security Council by advancing more frequent and timely consultations, as well as collaborative field missions with it. The Presidents of the Council should be encouraged to organize meetings that would promote such cooperation.

Lastly, and before I conclude, I would like to reaffirm the commitment of the three African members of the Security Council to continuing their efforts to improve the working methods of the Security Council, thereby enhancing the inclusivity and credibility of its work.

Mr. Yelchenko (Ukraine): At the outset, I would like to commend Japan's consistent and fruitful efforts during its previous and current memberships of the Security Council to streamline the work of the Council.

In recent years, we have seen some positive trends within the Council in the area of its working methods. First, taking into account the upcoming election of a new Secretary-General, it is important to make the election process in the Security Council as transparent and democratic as possible in order to facilitate the election of the best candidate who will advocate uncompromisingly for the full and unconditional implementation of the Charter of the United Nations. In that regard, Ukraine is encouraged by the approach introduced through General Assembly resolution 69/321, as well as by the joint letter of the Presidents of the Security Council and the General Assembly of 15 December 2015. Keeping in mind the importance of the selection result and the political responsibility for it, we believe that preserving the practice of making ad hoc decisions on many aspects of the process is not an option.

We also welcome the adoption of President's note S/2016/170, aimed at providing newly elected non-permanent members of the Council with sufficient time to get properly acquainted with the Council's work before joining the Council. In addition, it is important that the document has introduced more concrete guidelines on the process of appointing Chairpersons of the Council's subsidiary bodies.

The question of the veto is another subject that I would like to touch upon. Ukraine belongs to the group of States that supports both the code of conduct regarding Security Council action in response to genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes, and the French-Mexican initiative on suspending the use of the veto in cases of mass atrocities. At the same time, we are convinced that the very existence of the veto is a significant impediment to the Council's work. I should like to give just one telling example of that. Two days ago we marked the second anniversary of the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight MH-17. A joint attempt was made last year for the Council to establish a tribunal to prosecute those responsible for that heinous crime. Had it not been for the veto, the Council would have sent a strong message that there was no place for impunity today. While we are fully aware that a veto-free Council is a distant and uncertain reality, we would like to draw attention to the existing provision in the Charter of the United Nations that would prevent abuse of the right of the veto by the permanent members of the Council. It is a disgrace that paragraph 3 of Article 27 of the Charter — that a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting — continues to be blatantly ignored. It is imperative that clear proceedings be introduced for operationalizing and properly implementing this Article.

From an unbiased and objective position, it is clear that the Council should not face unsurmountable obstacles, especially internally, in organizing a field mission in response to a situation that warrants the Council's engagement on the ground. In that regard, we welcome the first steps taken, back in 2010, to introduce certain forn.al guidelines related to utilizing this important tool of the Council. We are ready to continue discussions within the Council to further develop and improve provisions on Security Council missions. We believe that the following important elements have to be clearly defined by the Council: mission planning and decision-making on its dispatching; the mission's composition; the reporting period and form of reporting; as well as the Council's decision-making on the mission's outcome.

The membership of the United Nations can definitely count on my delegation's support during the Council's work on the implementation of the outcome of today's discussion. For us it is obvious that this body, entrusted by the entire membership to maintain international peace and security, needs a substantial infusion of predictability and transparency to preserve and strengthen its credibility.

Mr. Delattre (France) (*spoke in French*): By way of thanking you, Mr. President, allow me point out Japan's very welcome contribution to the methods of work of the Security Council, which reflects, Sir, your rigour and professionalism. As suggested in your thought-provoking concept note (S/2016/585), I shall focus on a few points.

My first point is to recognize above all the profound evolution in the Council towards more transparency, which France welcomes, for the major debates of general interest are the business of all. However, that evolution has taken place at a time of unprecedented growth in the Council's work. ! dwell on that point to emphasize the need to stabilize the procedures so that they are appropriate and can be evaluated. France does not deem it necessary to modify presidential note S/2010/507 to a great degree — or to risk damaging the quality and continuity of the work of the Council — at a time replete with challenges and dangers, which should serve to mobilize all our diplomatic energies. France favours a constant legal codification of note 507 while incorporating the 13 new notes adopted since 2010, in addition to the one adopted last week, as well as presidential statements including those of October 2015 and February 2016, adopted, respectively, under the Spanish and Venezuelan presidencies.

My second point is to emphasize the need for the Council to monitor and promote accountability for its actions before all States Members of the United Nations, in the spirit of Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations. To that end, France considers it necessary to properly entrench the new pattern for electing non-permanent members in June and draw all of the consequences, namely, considering the Council's report to the General Assembly and increasing the time for newly elected members to become acquainted with the work of the Council and its subsidiary bodies. We welcome the recent adoption of the presidential note on that matter, and we congratulate the Japanese delegation for its efforts since January. In the same spirit, we welcome the Council's monthly wrap-up sessions in an open format in the Council Chamber, or under an interactive Toledo format as established by the Spanish presidency in October 2015. Finally, recent developments with regard to the process for appointing the Secretary-General and concerning the relationship between the General Assembly and the Security Council should be welcomed.

My third point will be dedicated to the issues of the continuum of peace and conflict prevention. The Council cannot but profit from the variety of partners in the informal interactive dialogues and so-called Arria Formula meetings. That allows it to expand its sources, to better inform its deliberations and to better anticipate through the use of informal formats and early warning so as to act as early as possible. A very important cultural change has taken place. To give a recent example, before the adoption of resolution 2295 (2016), on the situation in Mali, in June under the French presidency of the Council, an informal interactive dialogue, including the Prime Minister of Mali, was held instead of consultations, which allowed Council members to clearly understand the stakes facing Malians in that important negotiation. This format will more generally inevitably have a knock-on effect on the interaction within the Council by encouraging shorter and more informative interventions, rather than just a juxtaposition of static statements. In that the Council will find a considerable source for improving its efficiency. Reviewing the reporting cycle and publication schedule could also contribute to such efficiency, as the Council still faces too many compulsory dates that clutter the agenda to the detriment of an effective and creative

treatment hot crises. In other words, despite the urgent situations that remain, the Council must not give in to the routine of cycles and the illusion of productivism. We must not fall into the habit of necessarily concluding every meeting with a long-negotiated text, whose added value is sometimes limited.

Favouring an innovative format, during our presidency in March 2015 we organized an open debate (see S/PV.7414) to more closely consider the issue of children in armed conflict. Solely in our national capacity, we limited ourselves to a statement of the ideas exchanged. That statement usefully inspired Malaysia's consideration as Chair of the Working Group, prior to the adoption of resolution 2225 (2015) in June. The same applies to this debate and the summary of the open debate in October 2015 provided by the Spanish delegation. Finally, last month, we organized under our presidency an interactive and relevant ministerial debate on the protection of civilians, for which there was no need to adopt a text. Let us vary the formats of our meetings with a view primarily towards collective efficacy, not statistics.

In conclusion—and this is my last point—inclusiveness is an empty promise if it is not accompanied by a commitment to multilingualism, which is both an asset to our thinking and the necessary condition for truly participatory work. France also believes that e-working methods and management must not result in, or serve as a pretext for, diminishing the status accorded to each of the official languages and working languages.

It was France that, in December 1994, organized the first Council debate on its working methods (see S/PV.3483). We have come long way since then, but we still have a long way to go. We are confident that, under the leadership of Japan, we will continue to move forward together to make the Council a body that is both more efficient and more transparent and in the service of all.

Mrs. Adnin (Malaysia): Malaysia welcomes the convening of this open debate. We commend Japan's commitment in seeking continuous improvement in this important area of the work of the Security Council.

Malaysia joins other Council members in welcoming the just-adopted presidential note S/2016/619, which focuses on the issue of transitional arrangements for newly elected members of the Council. The consensus on this note is an important demonstration of the Council's commitment to support the call of the broader membership of the United Nations and to uphold the principles of transparency and inclusiveness in its work. We firmly believe that the note paves the way for more robust and timely engagement on the work of the Council by the newly elected members, including its subsidiary bodies.

Since joining the Council last year, Malaysia has been pleased to witness and be part of the positive trends towards better coordination and cooperation between the Security Council and the General Assembly. The good and constructive coordination and cooperation between the Council and the Assembly on the selection of the next Secretary-General is a good example. As stipulated by General Assembly resolution 69/321, the Assembly successfully undertook early elections for non-permanent members in June. That was a significant and important break from previous practice. From our own fairly recent experience, we can genuinely attest that time is indeed a precious commodity in the run-up to joining the Council. As such, for the incoming members, the additional time afforded could be taken advantage of, including by addressing key substantive issues and administrative concerns, among other issues.

We are also pleased that the note just adopted recognizes that the process of appointing new Chairs for Council subsidiary bodies should commence as soon as possible, with the full involvement of current and newly elected non-permanent members. In our view, such transparency and inclusivity would contribute immensely to improving the legitimacy of the process, particularly in the eyes of elected members and the wider United Nations membership.

A core component of the Council's responsibility revolves around the work of its subsidiary bodies, which are crucial for the implementation of Council decisions. Such bodies carry out a broad range of tasks, ranging from implementation monitoring and compliance assessment, to coordination and cooperation with regional and subregional organizations, among other tasks. In that connection, we fully support efforts to make the work of the subsidiary bodies more streamlined, coordinated and effective, including via the initiative by New Zealand regarding the communications of such bodies. Furthermore, Chairs of Council subsidiary bodies also have an important outreach role. Greater understanding of the work of the subsidiary bodies promotes better and more effective implementation of the Council's decisions.

At the same time, we believe there is cause for better coordination among subsidiary bodies, especially those with related themes and/or geographical scope. During our current term as a Council member, Malaysia has sought to promote and support the idea of working better across related themes and issues. By way of illustration, earlier this year, a joint consultation involving the Working Group on Children in Armed Conflict and the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 2206 (2015) concerning South Sudan. Similar joint consultations were held with the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 2140 (2014) and the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 2127 (2013) concerning the Central African Republic. We remain committed to pursuing such an approach to the end of our term. Looking ahead, we hope that such joint consultations could become a regular practice by the Council.

On a related issue, Malaysia welcomes the proposed initiative to update the Council's presidential note S/2010/507 on working methods. We stand ready to support and commit to such an initiative, including working towards a single comprehensive note.

In line with our collective effort to enhance the transparency, inclusiveness, coherence, accountability and, ultimately, the legitimacy of the Council and its work, we hope that the views of the wider membership expressed today will be reflected upon and duly taken into account in any possible Council outcome or future decisions on working methods.

Finally, I wish to underscore that improvements to Council working methods should be seen as part of a larger institutional or structural reform process, which requires significant political will and flexibility on the part of all Council members, permanent and non-permanent. This is crucial to ensure the Council's continued adaptability and to ensure that it remains relevant and appropriately equipped to address the immediate global peace and security challenges of the present, as well as in the future.

Mr. Gasso Matoses (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): You, Mr. President, have asked us focus our statements on three issues at most. We will limit ourselves to talking about just one theme, that is, working as a team in the Security Council. It is a matter of promoting the approach that has come to be known as the Toledo format, in reference to the Spanish city in which during there Middle Ages there flourished a spirit of collaboration and exchange among the Jewish, Christian and Muslim cultures.

While we have now served a year and a half in the Security Council, this is in fact our fifth term in this body. Participating in an intermittent way on the Council has enabled us to gain a different, interesting perspective that has shown us that teamwork is essential in order to improve three fundamental things — the effectiveness, transparency and impact of the Council's work, which ought to be our collective aim.

What do I mean by teamwork? The Security Council should not be the sum of 15 individual Member States, and much less one of 5+10. The Council is a collegial organ in which we all have a responsibility to actively participate. We all have something to contribute. Spain believes that the initiatives that have been led by various Member States from different regions, cultures and political perspectives all bring important added value. I should like to refer to various concrete examples, namely, Toledo briefings, joint statements, at both open and closed meetings, the practice of co-chairmanships of Council working groups, including with co-penholders, and the selection of the Secretary-General.

As most Council members and their assistants are already aware, Toledo briefings have been held with some regularity at the end of each presidency since last October. More than a mere recapitulation of the work of the Council over a given month, the Toledo format is an informal meeting where a group of Permanent Representataives respond to questions and comments from the membership about what has and has not been achieved during the month. I can think of no better example of an exercise in transparency, interaction and accountability to the rest of Members of the Organization.

Secondly, with regard to joint statements by members of the Council at open meetings, last October Spain convened a debate (see S/PV.7539) similar to today's in which we encouraged such statements — and I must say, with some success. The goal was not just to achieve more flexibility and effectiveness but, above all, greater clarity and strength in the positions. Six members of the Council spoke jointly, but Members of the Organization did so as well. Moreover, one member of the Council — France — decided to make a joint statement with a Member of the Organization that was not then a member of the Council, that is, with Germany. I think that is a very clear example of success in working

together. The same philosophy could be applied to the work of the Council in the closed-door meetings.

Thirdly, with regard to sharing leadership over work of the Council, the Egyptian Ambassador has already mentioned the issue, and I would associate myself with his position. Currently, 33 of 43 penholderships are in the hands of three members of the Council. We believe that work of the penholder undoubtedly has added value. Nevertheless, we think that teamwork in that regard could benefit from the varied composition of the whole Council by generating greater collaboration among the various members, thereby creating bridges over divisions.

Finally, allow me to quickly refer to the distribution of the joint chairmanships of the sanctions committees. Therein lies a clear example of the success of the Japanese presidency, and I congratulate you, Sir, on the note adopted last Friday. Under the note, for the first time, chairmanships of subsidiary bodies of the Council would was conducted in a spirit of full collaboration with the participation of all 15 Council members, under the leadership and the facilitation of two Council members.

Mr. Rycroft (United Kingdom): The working methods of the Security Council are absolutely key. Done well, they facilitate our work, provide a framework for our deliberations and allow us to take decisions that can help maintain international peace and security. Done less well, they prevent all that. Japan wrote the working methods bible, presidential note S/2010/507, and it is right that Japan is updating it.

How we work has a direct bearing on the impact that we have in the real world. The United Kingdom, like most of the rest of the General Assembly membership, I am sure, wants the Council to be more transparent, more inclusive, more interactive, more action-oriented and more efficient. Let me highlight two areas where I think we can improve our efficiency.

First, with regard to speaking limits, I hope that everyone can distil their points on any particular issue into five minutes, or today four minutes, in order to be efficient in our deliberations. Taking excessive time over interventions is counterproductive. People switch off. The shorter an intervention, the more likely it is to have an impact. We cannot, in any case, hope to cover everything that there is to say about a topic, so let us all — Council members, non-Council members and briefers — focus only on the things that really matter to us and stick to time, both here and in consultations.

Secondly, building on one of Ambassador Delattre's points, our programme of work is overloaded. It is driven more by reporting cycles than by what is happening in the real world. The globalized world is getting more complex, and we must ask ourselves if we are keeping up. So far, we have reviewed the periodicity of mandate and reporting cycles to try to address this, but I think we need to go further. Instead of receiving a programme of work filled on the basis of reporting cycles, incoming presidencies could set out what reports we expect to receive in a month and ask if there is a need for a meeting. That should cut out some meetings. We will always have the option of adding a meeting to the programme should the need arise, or of raising an issue under "other matters".

Finally, one of the risks to the Security Council — perhaps the greatest risk — is irrelevance. If we keep sticking to the status quo in our working methods, that risk will grow. We will need a more radical approach if we are to remain relevant. I support many of the proposals already put forward in the course of this debate. Let us get on and implement them.

Mr. Van Bohemen (New Zealand): New Zealand welcomes today's open debate. As Matthew Rycroft has just said, Security Council working methods matter because poor working methods can lead to poor outcomes. Progress has been made in recent years in codifying existing Council practice in documents such as presidential note S/2010/507, which we are reviewing today. That is welcome, as is the new presidential note S/2016/619 on transitional arrangements for incoming members.

But let us be honest — these notes and statements do not normally result in better Council performance. Today I will address a few areas where New Zealand has sought to improve Council culture and practice during our term, and where we think further work is required.

First, in regard to the quality of Council interactions, the Council was intended to be a collective security body. Too often, it is a forum for polarizing initiatives and last-minute take-it-or-leave-it drafts tabled by so-called penholders. Those practices leave no space for meaningful input from Council colleagues, let alone affected parties. New Zealand has made it a priority to try to create space for more meaningful discussions focused on identifying collective approaches and

solutions. During our presidency in July 2015, we initiated an ambassador-level breakfast at the start of the month. The aim was to have Permanent Representatives talk to each other about the challenges facing the Council and how they might be resolved. We are pleased that the breakfast is now becoming an established Council practice. We Permanent Representatives have had good conversations about how to manage the programme of work and topics of the moment, but we believe that we could do more if we were able and willing to engage in discussions of a more substantive, problem-solving nature.

Secondly, in regard to living up to our own undertakings, paragraph 44 of note S/2010/507 is clear that all draft resolutions should be introduced in informal consultations. That almost never happens. Penholders routinely take zero drafts straight to meetings of so-called experts. This precludes any real effort at building genuine consensus on the key policy questions to be considered. Non-penholders have to choose between accepting a text largely as presented, or risk being accused of torpedoing important documents if they wish to make substantive policy proposals. Those practices are neither effective, sustainable nor respectful of the perspectives of other Council members.

Thirdly, as regards more meaningful engagement with key stakeholders, despite the provisions in paragraph 33 of note S/2010/507, we are yet to see troop- and police-contributing countries consistently engaged in Council discussions. Those countries need regular meaningful engagement on issues of importance to their contingents. For a variety of reasons, the formal consultations held a few days before a draft resolution is adopted rarely produce useful conversations. Last year, New Zealand instituted the practice of holding informal triangular consultations among Council members, contributing countries and the Secretariat to discuss key issues and challenges facing a number of United Nations peacekeeping missions. We think it is important that that practice now be fully mainstreamed and become part of standard Council procedure.

Time constraints do not permit consideration of other areas where we consider Council working methods can be improved, but I want to make some more general observations.

First, elected members have to take responsibility for the way the Council operates. It is easy to blame permanence and the veto for the Council's dysfunction, but the acquiescence of the elected 10 members is also a big factor. Ten votes are needed to adopt any resolution. Procedural resolutions cannot be vetoed. If the elected 10 are prepared to assert themselves, the five cannot dictate terms, especially on working methods, which are quintessentially a procedural matter.

Secondly, Council practice in the operation of subsidiary bodies is a glaring case where Council habits well exceed the requirements of the Charter of the United Nations. Consensus is laudable if it strengthens the Council's voice, but to elevate consensus to the equivalent of a 15-member veto is foolish, particularly if it allows a single member to assert control over matters that the Charter never envisaged as subject to veto.

If we really want to make the Council work more effectively — and New Zealand passionately believes that we must — the elected 10 must use their influence and their legitimacy as the representatives of the wider United Nations membership to push for real change. Notes on working methods can be useful. More important, however, is the courage to change behaviour, to do things differently and to exercise the powers conferred on us under the Charter. In our own small way, New Zealand has tried to make a difference. We hope those that follow will continue our efforts.

Mr. Rosselli (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to begin by saying that I think Mr. Van Bohemen has just stated the points that we wanted to make much more eloquently than I can, and I fully support his statement. However, in order to enjoy my 15 minutes of fame, I shall deliver my statement anyway.

My delegation associates itself fully with the statement to be delivered by the representative of Switzerland on behalf of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency group.

I would like to talk about some of my personal experiences in the somewhat informal way that I usually prefer to address the Council. In fact, many of the things that the Council could undertake do not require new rules. Agreements may be reached but then are simply not implemented.

I would like to refer to two issues that are actually only one issue — that of transparency. The two themes that I want to address today are the drafting of resolutions and the formats of meetings. Presidential note S/2014/268, on the drafting of resolutions, refers

to three elements: consultations with Council members, penholdership, and consultations with relevant actors.

With regard to the first element, the note says that penholders should hold consult and exchange information with all Council members as early as possible in the drafting exercise. That generally does not occur, however. This has its roots in what we would call a cultural problem in the Council's functioning. The permanent members prepare draft resolutions, discuss them among themselves and share them at the end of that process, with very little time left before the document is to be presented for adoption. When we, the elected members, wish to make comments or suggestions on the text, we are usually told, "Well, what a shame! There is a very delicate balance that we need to strike in the wording of the text, and there is no time to incorporate any new suggestions".

This leaves the elected members with the options of either accepting a fait accompli, giving an explanation of vote, abstaining in the voting or voting against the draft resolution, even in cases where they endorse the content if not the particular wording. It is unfortunate that this culture of dominance by the five permanent members permeates all Council activities to the point that, when an elected member presides over the Council, the President cannot sign a simple procedural letter without subjecting that text to the prior scrutiny of permanent members. This occurs even when the letter is just a template of the sort that has been used throughout the Council's history. Ultimately, this culture of dominance by the permanent members is the fundamental reason that the Council's proceedings lack transparency.

Turning to the second element, regarding the active participation of all Council members in drafting documents, that does not happen either. In general, penholders are almost exclusively permanent members of the Council, and in most cases they are the so-called P-3. Uruguay believes that elected members could have a greater role in that regard. Suggestions to that end include the idea of a co-penholdership, which could be held by both a permanent and an elected member of the Council. We are not even close to reaching an agreement on that topic.

With regard to the third element — consultation with other relevant actors and other States Members of the United Nations, and in particular Member States concerned, including groups of friends — I would suggest that this is not the case either. Perhaps the sole exception is that of the Group of Friends of Haiti, which Uruguay chairs. Our delegation does indeed interact with the penholder, the United States, in the drafting of resolutions pertaining to the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti. For all these reasons, I must insist on the need to introduce a culture of greater inclusivity and transparency in the activities of the Council.

The final point I wish to make concerns something I have mentioned on several occasions, namely, the culture of holding open briefings in the Council, at which we listen to a briefing by a senior official and then quickly adjourn the meeting to move into the much-touted informal consultations. I will say it again — let us demystify the informal consultations. In general terms, they are merely a routine succession of delivery of previously prepared statements that put forward national positions. There is basically little debate or interaction among the membership. In my limited experience on the Council, there have been very few occasions on which I have heard any point made in those consultations that could not have been made in the open Chamber. That is why we believe that we need to have more open briefings at which Council members deliver their statements before the entire United Nations membership.

Obviously, the Council will continue to hold closed informal consultations, which provide a private atmosphere in which it can discuss some sensitive issues. However, open meetings should be the norm, which would be a major step forward in ensuring greater transparency before and accountability to Member States. I would like to highlight presidential note S/2016/619 and the improvements introduced therein with regard to the participation of new Council members, which, we trust, will contribute to improving the functioning of the Council.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The discussion of the working methods of the Security Council in an open format is an occasion to hear an outside assessment of the current state of affairs and be enriched by new ideas and proposals for improving the procedural aspects of Security Council activities, of course on the understanding is that the working methods themselves, as well as decisions on possible amendments thereto, are within the purview of the Security Council itself. Today's meeting has additional importance because it is presided over by the

delegation that heads the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters and that co-sponsored the best-known document on this matter, presidential note S/2010/507.

We note of Japan's intention to update note 507, which is of critical importance as a compendium of the Security Council's working practices. For our part, we stand ready to provide any necessary assistance to the Japanese delegation with that important work. We also note the contribution made by other non-permanent Council members to revitalizing the Council's working methods with new initiatives. We welcome the statement on the Toledo formula, delivered by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the African delegations. We also call on our European colleagues to add this innovation to their toolkits. For instance, some could associate themselves with the statements of the United States delegation.

Note 507 is not only actively used by Security Council members; it is also an important aid for non-permanent members preparing to work on the Council. That will be particularly relevant this year. The new members elected by the General Assembly in June will be able to attend Council meetings starting on 1 October. In October, the Security Council will be presided over by Russia. We stand ready to provide these members with assistance in the smooth beginning of their work on the Council, on the clear understanding that their term begins only on 1 January 2017.

We note that, in recent years, the activities of non-permanent members have increased significantly — a development that we fully welcome. Many of our non-permanent colleagues are not only making contributions to resolving pressing issues on the Council's agenda; in fact, they are also providing substantive initiatives and taking the lead in enhancing important areas of the Council's work. We are convinced that the Security Council would benefit from the further democratization of its work. In line with that would be a more equitable distribution of duties in informal leadership on country-specific and thematic issues — the so-called penholdership. Certain Council members should not regard countries or even regions as their tutees and act as mentors on certain issues. This is a vestige of a bygone era, entirely out of place in the twenty-first century.

By definition, the reform and improvement of the work of the Council should be increasing its effectiveness and efficiency in order to facilitate a fuller implementation of its mandate of maintaining international peace and security. One area requiring our attention is the Council's documentation overload. Each year, the Security Council distributes hundreds of documents, and let us acknowledge it that not all of them have added value. We are convinced that the Security Council's decisions and statements to the press should be terse, easy to understand and action-oriented. We should avoid situations in which Security Council resolutions contain up to 50 operative paragraphs and press statements go on for three pages, while the bulk of those documents contain repeated provisions from other documents.

Resolutions are no place for micromanagement. They should be concise and clear and their content must be political. We need to take steps to lighten the workload of the Council, which is already working at full capacity. I do not think that we will be able to reduce the number of meetings, particularly given the growing instability in the world; however, the Council's workload should be taken into account by Council members when they decide to convene meetings — especially thematic ones — and as they consider the optimal format for such meetings and the number of rapporteurs or briefers. At present, we are hearing five briefers in some meetings. We think that there should be no more than three.

The most important consideration should be the added value of the event or meeting and how much it is likely to improve the situation in practice. We believe that the Council should not take up topics that it cannot take decisions on. We also believe that the Council should remain focused on country-specific issues; it should neither encroach upon the mandates of other United Nations bodies nor attempt to act in the stead of the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, the Human Rights Council or other organs. Such initiatives could undermine the organization of the United Nations system as a whole.

It is absolutely clear that the Security Council is a favourite of global media, and it is tempting to use the media for self-promotion, including to promote domestic political agendas. We know that we cannot expect Council members to behave like saints but we would nevertheless ask them to act in the interests of supporting international peace and security first and foremost.

Mr. Liu Jieyi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): In recent years, while fully discharging its responsibilities, the Security Council has worked to improve its working methods, increase efficiency and enhance transparency. With efforts of the Council members and the support of the broader membership of the United Nations, the Council has constantly improved its working methods in practice and has made positive progress.

There has been a marked increase in the number of open debates of the Council. The Council has strengthened coordination with the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and other United Nations bodies as well as regional organizations. The Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters has adopted numerous notes by the President, made recommendations on improving the Council's annual report, maintained regular contact with the Peacebuilding Commission and strengthened interactions with countries that contribute troops to peacekeeping operations. All of these efforts have yielded good results. China supports the Council in its continued efforts to improve its working methods. We believe that attention should be given to the following three areas.

First, key points should be highlighted to ensure their effect. The Charter of the United Nations contains specific provisions on the responsibilities of the Council and other United Nations bodies. The Council should concentrate its energy and resources on addressing pressing issues threatening international peace and security to improve the real effect of its actions. While deliberating on some special topics, the Council should align and coordinate its efforts with those of the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and other United Nations bodies in order to avoid duplication.

Secondly, it is imperative to emphasize consultation and collective decision-making. When it comes to decision-making at the Council and its subsidiary bodies, Council members should engage in adequate consultations in a bid to achieve consensus. If there are still significant differences between parties, no actions should be forced through. Rather, parties should insist on seeking maximum consensus so as to safeguard the authority of the Council.

Thirdly, to strengthen good offices, coordination and communication, the Council should champion and advance the culture of peace and give full play to political means, such as preventive diplomacy, mediation and good offices to push for diplomatic solutions to crises and avoid the use or the threat of use of sanctions wantonly. The Council should strengthen coordination with the Member States and regional organizations, heed the input of the countries on its agenda and draw on the experience of regional organizations in dealing with regional issues and leverage their advantages in terms of close geographical distance, history and culture. In this way, the Council can more reasonably make decisions and form synergies so as to jointly play a role in seeking the peaceful settlement of disputes.

China has always supported with its actions the efforts of the Council to improve its working methods so that it can work more equitably, efficiently and transparently and better respond to the expectations of the Member States and the international community. China stands ready to work together with members of the Council and the wider membership of the United Nations to draw upon experience and make innovations in order to push for active fulfilment of the Council's duties so as to play a constructive role in safeguarding international peace and security.

Ms. Sison (United States of America): At a time when the Security Council is grappling with crises from South Sudan to Syria, when the Council's and the United Nations response to terrorism is ever more important, and with threats from pandemics to proliferation requiring united action, it is appropriate that we discuss our working methods. I would like to touch on three aspects: first, how we conduct meetings, including in consultations; secondly, the importance of the deliberations of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters; and finally, the selection of the Secretary-General.

My delegation and others have tried to make Security Council meetings here in the open Chamber more topical and more oriented towards action. We have also tried to bring humanity into the Chamber and by that I mean real people. One of the most memorable Council events I was ever a part of was the meeting during our presidency on human trafficking, when we heard from Nadia Murad Basee Taha, a Yazidi victim of trafficking by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (see S/PV.7585). Her searing account was unforgettable and drove home the need for Member States — for all of us — to act to combat trafficking.

Against this backdrop we do believe that the connection between human rights abuses and threats

to international peace and security is clear and real and merits Council attention, which is why we wholeheartedly support briefings in the Council by officials from the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. We should not have to surmount procedural obstacles to learn more about dire human rights situations in North Korea or Ukraine or anywhere else. Behind closed doors in consultations, the Council needs to be more interactive and more oriented towards results.

During our most recent presidencies, the United States injected into our proceedings additional ways for us to actually talk with each other, which has meant turning more regularly to the briefer for follow-up. It has meant urging Council members to jump back into the discussion, even if they had already made a statement. And it has meant Council members sometimes asking each other questions to clarify positions. The dictionary definition of a consultation is a meeting for deliberation, discussion or decision, and we want to put an accent on that "decision" part. As a Council, we must ensure that our decisions must emerge from real discussions will we truly get at the facts.

I would like to thank the Japanese delegation for its extremely capable stewardship of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters and the Angolan delegation for its work last year as well. Just the other day, the Council reached agreement on a note the Working Group produced on how to integrate newly elected members into our work (S/2016/619). In the past few years, the Working Group has made important contributions to the Council's daily work, drafting notes that improved our approach on preparing products, strengthened the continuity of the work of the Council's subsidiary organs and clarified how we set speaking order at meetings.

We understand that the Japanese Chair would like the Working Group to consider ways to revamp the note S/2010/507 of the President of the Security Council. We look forward to working with Japan and the rest of the Council on this effort. And consistent with the spirit of transparency, the process by which we are selecting the next Secretary-General has also undergone positive changes this year.

Using General Assembly resolution 69/321 as our guide, we were pleased to participate in the many innovations created this year in response to calls from Member States and from the wider public to increase transparency in the selection process. We have supported its implementation every step of the way and have encouraged candidates to take advantage of the new procedures, especially the General Assembly informal dialogues. I would like to thank President of the General Assembly Lykketoft for his commitment to the dialogues and for his enthusiasm in carrying out the letter and spirit of resolution 69/321.

The time has come for us in the Security Council to fulfil our responsibility, as laid out clearly in the United Nations Charter and to show the world that we are up to the task of recommending for appointment the best person to lead the Organization as the next Secretary-General. We look forward to getting under way and to our first straw poll on Thursday. We think the Council should be decisive and aim for early agreement that would give the next Secretary-General time to prepare to assume the office. The United States looks forward to working with all Council members in this process.

Mr. Suárez Moreno (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mr. President, we congratulate you on the work you have done in your capacity as Chair of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters and for all your efforts in preparing and facilitating the note of the President of the Security Council contained in document S/2016/619.

My country aligns itself with the statement to be made by the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

We do not want to repeat some of the points that have already been raised, but we would like to fully endorse the statement that was made by the Permanent Representative of Uruguay. However, we would like to add a few comments of our own.

The note of the President of the Security Council that we have adopted under your presidency, Sir, is helping us to move forward in democratizing the election of the Chairs of the subsidiary bodies of the Security Council and in making the process fairer and more transparent. Although we would have liked to go much further in that regard, we know too well how difficult it is to move forward along those lines. We continue to call for a balanced, transparent and inclusive appointment of the Chairpersons of the subsidiary bodies of the Security Council. In that connection, we welcome the progress made by appointing such Chairpersons as soon as possible after the election

of the Council's non-permanent members. We must help the elected members to better prepare for, and participate in, chairing the subsidiary bodies, as it is we who will need to deal with the administrative tasks and the attendant frustrations.

As we make progress in the democratization of the election process of the Chairpersons for the Council's subsidiary bodies, we must also move to make the work of those groups more transparent. Transparency in the working methods of the sanctions committees is particularly important.

With 16 active sanctions regimes, sanctions have become an essential tool of the Security Council. Sanctions are temporary tools and should not be seen as an end in and of themselves. The Council should therefore not prolong the mandate of those committees indefinitely. In that connection, it would be necessary to pinpoint the objectives behind the establishment of each committee and to conduct regular evaluations to determine if those goals are being achieved.

We need to consider and address the issue of the duration of sanctions regimes. A country entering a sanctions regime has no way of knowing how to exit it. Often, the reasons for which a sanctions committee was created disappear, and are then immediately replaced by new reasons, making it apparent that, frequently, the sanctions imposed by the Security Council, under pressure from some of its permanent members, are simply a means to punish some countries and not others. In that way, some sanctions regimes are extended indefinitely, although their reason for existing is unclear. The issue of sanctions requires much attention. There is much that we can do to make sanctions regimes much more fair, clear, transparent and adapted to international law.

In conclusion, we would like to draw attention to the obstacles preventing some agenda items that affect international peace and security from being dealt with in open meetings, with Western Sahara being a case in point. The limited consideration given to that protracted conflict reveals the existence of double standards, since the same issue is addressed behind closed doors, without the other members having access to the views expressed by the members of the Security Council. Since the Security Council acts on behalf of the Members of the Organization, in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations, we would hope the Council would seek to be more transparent and inclusive by presenting the Secretary-General's report on the Western Sahara in an open or public format, with the participation of the representative of the African Union, bearing in mind that that regional organization is a strategic partner of the United Nations in the peaceful resolution of conflicts afflicting the African continent, including the Western Sahara.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Mexico.

Mr. Ruiz Cabañas (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): This annual debate has been held since 2010, but I believe, Sir, that today bears particular symbolic importance as we celebrate the tenth anniversary of presidential note S/2006/507, on the working methods of the Security Council, also under the leadership of your country, Japan.

The 2006 presidential note was the first step in ensuring that the Organization's States Members could make recommendations on the working methods, practices and formats of the Security Council with a view to effectively dealing with threats to international peace and security. We realize that the working methods of the Council are constantly changing. Proof of that is that in 2010, also under Japan's presidency and with Mexico as an elected member of the Council, there was an important updating and broadening of the earlier presidential note. Since that time, 13 additional notes have been issued, covering various aspects of the working methods of the Council. That is why Mexico welcomes the proposal that the Council once again update that note through the relevant working group, keeping in mind our successes and, above all, our goals and how we can reach them.

We have undoubtedly made progress in the past decade. The participation of many Member States in this open debate, as well as in other events, is a patent manifestation of the Council's improved working methods. Even if the pace of the improvements is slower than many would like, there are unambiguous indicators of the interest on the part of most to continue working towards great transparency and accountability. The holding of monthly meetings by some members of the Council at the end of each presidency has enabled the Council to increase the transparency it could not achieve during its work. In the interest of transparency, it is imperative for more and more countries to adopt such an approach.

Similarly, public meetings, interactive informal consultations and Arria Formula meetings are mechanisms that have enabled greater interaction between members of the Council and other Member States, as well as other actors like civil society, and, at the same time, have allowed us to contribute to the transparency, legitimacy and effectiveness of the Council.

Another recent and critical change was the early election in June of new members of the Security Council, consistent with the recommendations in presidential note 507 and as reinforced by the presidential note presented a few days ago (S/2016/619). That decision will allow a significant period of transition between incoming and outgoing members, as the former can prepare ahead of time and attend, by invitation, Council meetings starting in October, months before the start of their term.

Finally, we believe that the flow of information to non-member States of the Council regarding the items under discussion in the Chamber has seen an improvement in recent years, in line with the recommendations in presidential note 507. That has been possible thanks to the commitment of some Council members, especially elected members, to keep their colleagues informed, and to the work of non-governmental organizations and academia in analysing and disseminating information relating to the Security Council.

At this moment of reflection, I would point out some elements that can and must continue to be improved.

First, it is essential for all members of the Council, both permanent and non-permanent, to draft and promote resolutions and statements concerning all aspects germane to this organ. Despite some limited progress in recent years, some draft resolutions are still drafted exclusively by the permanent members, a practice that must be avoided, as set forth in presidential note S/2014/268 two years ago.

We welcome the fact that, for the first time ever, the process of selecting the next Secretary-General will be more transparent and inclusive, and in particular that the General Assembly will play a major role. In a few days, the straw poll to elect candidates will begin in the Security Council. In that connection, I commend efforts to submit more than one name to the General Assembly in order to lend the selection of the next Secretary-General a genuine air of democracy. It will also be important to consider gender balance, as a quick glance at the history of the Organization will reveal that a woman has never been appointed to the position of Secretary-General.

Another issue that must be considered is the use of the veto power. For the past two years, Mexico and France have promoted an initiative to voluntarily refrain from its use in cases of mass atrocities. We believe that that initiative is one of the most realistic short-term options to reform the Security Council. Consequently, we are grateful that approximately 100 countries have decisively signed on to the initiative.

We also recognize the efforts and contributions of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency Group, and in particular its code of conduct on the veto, which is another related initiative. Similarly, on the issues of accountability and the fight against impunity, we reaffirm the importance of the principle that the Council continue to be guided by clear, objective, and non-politicized criteria in the submission of cases to the International Criminal Court, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. We support the initiative to create a mechanism within the Security Council to follow up on those referrals, especially when the Court itself sends notification of a lack of cooperation on the part of the State concerned.

Finally, a pending, but highly relevant, issue is the adoption of the rules of procedure of the Council. More than 70 years after its creation, the Council's rules should cease to be provisional so that we can strengthen the certainty of the Council's working methods.

After 10 years of discussion on working methods, the adoption of more than a dozen documents and the holding of several open debates, the progress achieved should be celebrated. However, we must also reflect on the reasons that the implementation of certain recommendations has been prevented, and direct our efforts towards ensuring compliance with them. It is important to make new proposals, but it is also important to accomplish what we have committed ourselves to.

I therefore welcome once again the efforts of Japan, as champion of this initiative, as well as its work within the framework of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters.

The President: I now give the floor to Mr. Carlos Foradori, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina.

Mr. Foradori (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): I wish to thank Japan for convening this open debate on

the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the adoption of presidential note S/2006/507, the first note of the President of the Security Council on the working methods of the Council. I also wish to express my country's appreciation for Japan's continued commitment to improving transparency, inclusiveness and efficiency in the work of the Council during its chairmanship of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters, both during this period and during its previous term in 2009-2010.

Argentina has historically advocated for a more transparent and democratic Security Council whenever it has had the opportunity to do so. It was Argentina that, in February 2000, during its presidency of the Council, encouraged the adoption of presidential note S/2000/155, in accordance with which recently elected members were invited to participate as observers in informal consultations during the month before the beginning of their mandate.

More recently, Argentina was a driver and supporter of various initiatives to achieve greater transparency and access to the Council for the United Nations membership as a whole, including dialogue between the Council and countries and bodies that are not members of the Council; consultations among the Security Council, the Secretariat and troop- and police-contributing countries; greater involvement by the elected members of the Council in the drafting of Council documents; and the efforts to ensure the continuity of the work of the subsidiary bodies of the Council.

Argentina considers essential the regular review of the implementation of presidential note S/2006/507 and other relevant notes aimed at identifying successful practices and possible shortcomings, and at considering the implementation of the necessary adjustments. In that regard, Argentina encourages the Informal Working Group to continue working towards a single comprehensive document in order to consolidate and rationalize all decisions on working methods. The goal of having a more democratic and transparent Security Council presupposes and requires that the path to the Council's transformation be through the practices I have referred to, in consultation with the entire membership, so as to bring it about in the most legitimate and representative way possible. That will ensure that the process of methodological development moves forward in a positive way, while respecting and taking into account the expectations of the entire international community.

As has recently been stated, what is at stake is the Council's decision-making culture and its effectiveness, which fully affect its performance. The updating of the Security Council's working methods in response to the demands of the international community, with a view to strengthening its democratization and ensuring greater inclusiveness, accountability and transparency, remains an important objective, which Argentina endorses. In that regard, Argentina reaffirms and pledges its best efforts to contribute to this process.

Argentina endorses the principle of the non-indifference in the internal affairs of States. We are not indifferent in the face of violations of the basic principles of democracy, regardless of where they occur. We want to be consistent with that premise and those principles. In that regard, we want point out that we are concerned when the democratization process affects certain bodies, for we believe that when those principles are promoted, they should be promoted everywhere, in every situation and throughout all entities. That is why we believe that the Security Council is not the exception and that it is very important to uphold the principles of democracy in all their forms and on all occasions.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Switzerland.

Mr. Lauber (Switzerland): I am pleased to take the floor in my capacity as Coordinator of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency (ACT) Group.

As you mentioned, Mr. President, it has been 10 years since the adoption of presidential note S/2006/507. I take this opportunity to acknowledge the improvements in the Council's working methods that we have seen since then, and in particular Japan's efforts and contributions, which have added to that positive development. At the same time, we must recognize that the world's expectations vis-à-vis the Council have certainly not decreased, but rather increased, over the past 10 years. We therefore insist that our common efforts to improve the accountability, coherence, transparency and, ultimately, the effectiveness of the Council must continue. Let me make some specific points in that connection.

The ongoing process to select the next Secretary-General is just one example of the strong interest of the general membership in a more transparent Security

Council. For the first time in history, 12 individuals have taken part in informal dialogues organized by the President of the General Assembly, after they submitted their curriculums vitae and vision statements. The ACT group calls upon any potential future candidates to be presented as early as possible and to participate in the same General Assembly process.

We understand that the first straw poll of the Security Council will take place later this week. The ACT group believes the wider membership needs to be informed of the outcome of that and subsequent polls and strongly encourages close communication between the President of the Council and the President of the General Assembly in that regard. The ACT group also reiterates that it is the prerogative of the General Assembly to draft the resolution on the appointment of the next Secretary-General.

The ACT group calls on all States to adhere to the code of conduct, a pledge to support timely and decisive Security Council action in situations involving atrocity crimes. So far, 112 Member States have joined the code. We encourage them to make sure that the code is being implemented. That means applying and invoking it consistently in all relevant country situations before the Council.

Following the October 2015 open debate on working methods (see S/PV.7539), the Council adopted presidential statement S/PRST/2015/19. The ACT group welcomes the commitment therein to holding an annual open debate on working methods. That statement also takes note of the efforts of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters to enhance the transparency of its activities, including by providing regular briefings to interested Member States. The ACT group looks forward to participating in such meetings. We also believe that the report prepared by Spain containing recommendations gleaned from the 2015 open debate could serve as guidance for the work of the Informal Working Group, and we encourage the Group to consider it fully.

The ACT group welcomes presidential note S/2016/619, adopted last week. We are pleased that the period of observation for incoming Council members has been extended to three months. We call on Council members to implement that provision to the maximum extent possible, as stated in the note.

The ACT group also welcomes the arrangement regarding the appointment of the Chairs of subsidiary bodies no later than 1 October each year and the fact that the process will be facilitated jointly by two members of the Council, thereby providing an enhanced role for the elected 10 members of the Council.

Sixty-two per cent of the Council's meetings in 2015 took place in the format of closed consultations, which is a significant increase in comparison with previous years. In addition, the Council also considered 56 issues under "Any other business". While we welcome the fact that the Council acts quickly with regard to urgent situations, we need also to underline that the enhanced use of "Any other business" and closed meetings does not add to the transparency of the Council's work.

The ACT group also welcomes the practice of providing public wrap-up meetings and informal briefing sessions to non-members. More recently, Council members have also conducted joint informal briefings by the presidency at the end of the month. That practice has shown that formal public wrap-ups and informal briefings do not replace each other and, on the contrary, may be mutually reinforcing.

Finally, the ACT group welcomes the efforts of Japan as Chair of the Informal Working Group to prepare a new note that would consolidate and streamline all decisions taken regarding working methods since the publication of presidential note S/2010/507. We encourage the Council to provide an updated, strong and comprehensive document that can lay the groundwork for further positive developments in this domain. Implementation will of course remain at the centre of our attention.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Brazil.

Mr. De Aguiar Patriota (Brazil): Let me start by referring to the selection of the next Secretary-General. We appreciate that the current process was formally started by a joint letter from the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council inviting Member States to submit proposed candidates. The unprecedented hearings are important steps forward towards the democratization of the selection process. Brazil believes that the role of the General Assembly is not simply to rubber-stamp decisions taken previously by the Security Council. We agree with Assembly President Lykketoft — and with the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency (ACT) Group, for that matter — as stated in his letter

dated 7 July, that the result of the informal straw polls should be made available to the general membership.

The review of the Peacebuilding Architecture empowered the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in its advisory capacity to the Security Council. The Council and the PBC can expand their synergies and draw upon the expertise of the Commission in assisting with the longer-term perspective required for sustaining peace. We believe that there is value added in inviting the Chairs of the PBC configurations to informally meet Council members before a situation that they follow closely is up for review. In the same vein, the Council should consider inviting the Chairs of PBC configurations to join official missions.

There is room for improvement in the Council's working methods with regard to the implementation of the Council's decisions authorizing the use of force and the follow-up to communications submitted under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. As highlighted by the Secretary-General in the report on the responsibility to protect (S/2015/500), it is important to further strengthen the reporting and reviewing procedures for the implementation of Security Council resolutions authorizing the use of force by third parties, so as to ensure that the mandates given by the United Nations are being properly implemented. Brazil recalls its proposal containing two practical steps, both of which are based on existing mechanisms in the Security Council.

First, we should import from the peacekeeping system the practice of sunset clauses, reporting and briefings to delegations. Secondly, we should create monitoring mechanisms by establishing panels of experts modelled after the United Nations sanctions committees. In addition to proper authorization, it is essential that the Security Council be kept informed about the military actions carried out on its behalf as part of its role in legitimizing the use of force. That role includes not only deciding to initiate military action, but also ensuring, for instance, its proportionality and conformity with international humanitarian law, as well as determining the appropriate time to conclude the intervention.

Brazil has also taken note of the increase in the number of letters to the Security Council under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations that seek to justify military actions, most of the time ex post facto, in the context of countering terrorism. Without prejudice to the necessary debate on the actual content of such communications, it is also important to reflect on whether they fulfil the obligation to "report immediately" as stipulated in the Charter, which applies to all actions undertaken under that provision. Such communications do not release the Security Council from its primary responsibilities. A proper follow-up to such communications by the Council seems necessary.

It is desirable that the troop- and police- contributing countries be included in the decision-making process leading to the deployment of peacekeeping operations. We need to balance the perspectives of those crafting mandates and those implementing them. In addition, penholderships must be more equitably shared. The fact that elected members have reduced opportunities to take initiatives is linked, of course, with another unresolved problem, that is, the comprehensive reform of the Security Council. No change in the working methods alone will be able to tackle some of the main challenges currently faced by the Council. As many have pointed out during the current session of intergovernmental negotiations, the longer the reform of the Security Council takes, the more the United Nations puts its credibility and long-term legitimacy at risk. Improving the working methods of the Security Council depends, to a great extent, on a comprehensive reform capable of leading to more effective, transparent and legitimate decision-making processes.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Colombia.

Mr. Ruiz Blanco (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): As pointed out in the concept note (S/2016/585, annex) circulated for this open debate, improving transparency, efficiency, inclusion and accountability in the working methods of the Security Council is essential if we want to achieve harmonization between the decisions taken by the Security Council on peace and security and the support that those decisions receive from the entire membership, particularly that of Member States that are not part of the Council. Those four elements are essential to creating a culture of decision-making that is in concert with collective interests. It is precisely such interactions and constructive dialogue with non-members of the Council that must serve as a guide in identifying the practices that have proved successful, those that require improvement and those that have not yet been included in the working methods of the Council.

With today marking 10 years since the adoption of presidential note S/2006/507 — which has become a compilation of measures that must guide the Council's work — and nearly six years since the subsequent presidential note S/2010/507, which broadened and replaced that list of practices, I would like to make an earnest call to ensure its effective implementation and continued improvement.

In the area of communications, Colombia recognizes the efforts made since December 2005 by the various Presidents of the Security Council who, together with the Presidents of the General Assembly, have maintained an ongoing dialogue and have informed Member States in a timely manner about developments with regard to the process of selecting the next Secretary-General. That has greatly contributed to the transparency and inclusiveness of the process. We therefore wish to explore the possibility of repeating that practice, so that it can be applied to other matters of shared interest.

Moreover, in connection with documentation, Colombia believes that it is essential to ensure that the annual reports presented by the Council to the General Assembly have a broad analytical component and discuss the reasons that have led it to take its decisions, especially in those situations where action was taken by the Council. That would ensure that the reports are truly informative rather than merely descriptive, as is currently the case. With regard to the programme of work, it is necessary to continue the good practice of publishing the monthly forecast by the Council presidency, keep it updated, make it publicly available, modify it whenever necessary and distribute it to the members of the Council with the appropriate changes.

Finally, with regard to transparency, it is increasingly necessary to move away from the practice of closed meetings and to hold open or public meetings more frequently, so that non-member countries may contribute to deliberations. In that way, Colombia firmly believes that the continuous improvement and proper implementation of the working methods of the Security Council will strengthen and improve the interaction between it and the other States not on the Council.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan.

Ms. Lodhi (Pakistan): My delegation wants to express its gratitude to you, Sir, for organizing today's important debate.

My delegation aligns itself with the statement to be delivered by the representative of Iran on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (NAM).

Pakistan welcomes the gradual improvements in the Security Council's working methods, especially since 2006. Those improvements have in particular been the result of efforts by the non-permanent members of the Security Council. In that connection, the early election of non-permanent members this year was a positive step. We believe that that will help non-permanent members play a more robust and effective role during their tenure in the Council.

We are hopeful that, with the cooperation of all Council members, the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters will continue to endeavour to improve the Council's working methods, thereby contributing positively to the Council's openness, transparency and accountability.

Pakistan endorses the recommendations to be made by the representative of Iran on behalf of NAM to improve the Security Council's working methods. Furthermore, and in deference to your request for succinct suggestions today, Sir, Pakistan would like to offer the following.

First, dialogue with the wider United Nations membership is critical. After all, Member States not serving on the Council have high stakes in the Council's decisions.

Second, it is important for the Council to implement its presidential note S/2014/565, in letter and in spirit. That note was the culmination of Pakistan's initiative, when it was a Council member in 2013, to improve intra-Council communication and exchange of information. It is important to hear the views of the current non-permanent members regarding implementation of the note.

Third, Pakistan would appreciate an assessment of the implementation of presidential note S/2014/268. An objective evaluation of the fulfilment of the commitments made in the note is important to ensure the wider participation of Council members in delivering on the Council's responsibilities.

Fourth, troop- and police-contributing countries (TCCs) must be closely consulted before the formulation and approval of peacekeeping mandates. Such involvement will address many issues related to command, control, communication, coordination and

inter-mission movements. Such consultations will also help to sync peacekeeping missions with the realities on the ground.

Fifth, the implementation of presidential note S/2013/630 is particularly important for the Council's management and operation of peacekeeping missions. In this regard, it is imperative to know how the major TCCs view the implementation of this note. As a leading troop-contributing country, Pakistan believes that much needs to be done to ensure deeper and more meaningful consultations on all aspects of peacekeeping. The Chair of the Informal Working Group may wish to collate the views of all TCCs speaking today to assess the stakeholders' perception in this regard.

Sixth, regarding the working of the Council's subsidiary bodies, Pakistan calls for transparent processes leading to balanced representation on the Council's expert panels.

Seventh, and lastly, ensuring the independence of the Office of the Ombudsperson is of vital importance to address concerns on due process in the sanctions Committees. There is also no justification for limiting the scope of the Ombudsperson to just one sanctions Committee.

Before concluding, let me express my appreciation for the practice adopted today of commencing work on an important issue only after listening to the views of the wider membership rather than concluding work before giving an opportunity to non-Council members to express themselves.

The Council, according to the Charter, is obliged to act on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations. This responsibility can be fulfilled only once the Council listens to them before acting on their behalf.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. Khoshroo (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). Let me first express the appreciation of NAM to you, Sir, and to the Japanese presidency of the Council for having convened this debate on the Council's working methods and for presenting the concept note (S/2016/585, annex) on the issue.

In view of the time limit and the fact that the NAM position on the subject at hand is reflected in the May 2014 final document of the seventeenth Ministerial Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement, I will confine myself to the following nine specific measures that NAM calls for, with a view to improving the working methods of the Council and enhancing its efficiency in fulfilling its primary responsibility.

First, the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, which have remained provisional for 70 years, should be formalized in order to improve its transparency and accountability.

Second, the number of public meetings should be increased, in accordance with Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter of the United Nations, and the meetings should provide real opportunities to take into account the views and contributions of the wider membership of the United Nations, particularly non-members of the Council whose affairs are under discussion by the Council.

Third, closed meetings and informal consultations should be kept to a minimum and should be the exception rather than the rule. Meetings should be open, especially when they include briefings by the Special Envoys or Representatives of the Secretary-General and the United Nations Secretariat.

Fourth, the establishment of subsidiary organs by the Council should be in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, and those organs should function in a manner that provides adequate and timely information on their activities to the broader United Nations membership.

Fifth, the annual reports of the Security Council to the General Assembly should be more explanatory, comprehensive and analytical, and they should assess the work of the Council, including cases in which the Council has failed to act. They should also include the views expressed by members during consideration of agenda items. We also call on the Council to elaborate on the circumstances under which it adopts the various outcomes, be they resolutions, presidential statements, press statements or other elements to the press.

Sixth, the Council should, pursuant to Article 15, paragraph 1, and Article 24, paragraph 3, of the Charter, submit special reports for consideration by the General Assembly.

Seventh, the Council should ensure that its monthly assessments are comprehensive and analytical and that they are issued in a timely fashion. The General

Assembly may consider proposing parameters for the elaboration of such assessments.

Eighth, the Council should fully take into account the recommendations of the General Assembly on matters relating to international peace and security, consistent with Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Charter.

Ninth, the Council should cease its ongoing attempts to shift issues on the agenda of the General Assembly or the Economic and Social Council over to the Security Council and the encroachment by the latter on the functions and powers of the Assembly.

The Non-Aligned Movement rejects the use of the Security Council as a tool to pursue national political interests and agendas, since that practice aggravates rather than alleviates situations and runs counter to its mission as enshrined in the Charter.

We reiterate the need for non-selectivity, impartiality and accountability in the work of the Council. A decision by the Security Council to initiate formal or informal discussions on the situation in any Member State or on any issue that does not constitute a threat to international peace and security is contrary to Article 24 of the Charter. In such cases, there is a need for the Council to remain strictly within the powers and functions accorded to it by Member States under the Charter.

In recent years, the Security Council has been too quick to threaten or authorize enforcement action in some cases, while remaining silent and inactive in others. Furthermore, the Council has increasingly resorted to Chapter VII of the Charter as an umbrella for addressing issues that do not necessarily pose an immediate threat to international peace and security. Instead of making excessive and quick resort to Chapter VII, efforts should be made to fully utilize the provisions of Chapters VI and VIII for the pacific settlement of disputes.

As we approach the process of appointing a new Secretary-General of the Organization, NAM underlines its position as elaborated in the Algiers ministerial declaration of May 2014, along with the central role of the General Assembly in the process of selecting and appointing the Secretary-General, and expresses its support for efforts aimed at reinforcing and strengthening the role of the Assembly in that regard.

Finally, for NAM, transparency, openness and consistency are key elements that the Security Council should observe in all its activities, approaches and procedures. We regret that the Council has neglected those important elements in numerous instances. Examples of those failures can be seen in the Council's reluctance to convene open debates on certain issues of great significance, its holding of unscheduled open debates with selective notifications, its practice of repeatedly restricting participation in certain debates and of discriminating between members and non-members of the Council, particularly with regard to the sequence in and time limits for statements during the open debates.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of India.

Mr. Akbaruddin (India) I take the floor with a sense of unease that stems from the old saying, "Expectation is the mother of all frustration". Many of us regularly articulate suggestions for enhancing transparency, effectiveness and inclusiveness in the work of the Security Council. In doing so, we begin to harbour certain expectations from this organ. Yet these suggestions, supported by many, remain largely unimplemented. Notwithstanding persistent efforts, sadly, progress on working methods of the Council is best measured not by what has been achieved but how much more remains to be done.

Today, following your advice, Mr. President, I limit my focus to just two aspects that are always wished for but never achieved. The first is the need to change the processes followed in the subterranean universe of the Council's subsidiary bodies. The subterranean universe I refer to consists of all 26 sanctions regimes acting on behalf of the Council. On the average, they cumulatively take a thousand decisions a year. However, rare is the occasion when the Chair of any of these bodies briefs Member States or the media about the proceedings after their meetings.

Mr. President, in your statement you mentioned that you are conducting a press stake-out after every session of informal consultations. You also referred to the fact that informal wrap-up briefing sessions are now becoming a practice. We compliment you on these efforts, but I would ask why these efforts at transparency do not extend to the subterranean universe, where more decisions are taken than in formal meetings or informal consultations. Why is it that we are blandly informed of positive decisions of this subterranean universe and

never told about negative decisions when proposals are not adopted?

When a draft resolution of the Council is voted upon, all of us know who votes for what, and Member States explain their positions. However, in the subterranean world of subsidiary bodies, there is no explanation given. No one says what the rationale for acceptance is. Furthermore, a rejection does not even surface in the public space. No one indicates who specifically is not supporting a request. Indeed, proposals that do not survive are buried without public acknowledgement that they were ever considered.

In the subterranean universe, all decisions are required to be taken by unanimity, a practice that is not in vogue in the Council itself. The trend now is to consider means to curtail the use of the veto in the Council's own work, and many Council members today support such efforts. However, in the subsidiary bodies, all Council Members have extended vetoes to themselves as members of sanctions committees.

In the subterranean universe of subsidiary bodies, the adoption of principles of anonymity and unanimity have absolved individual members of accountability. Taking their cue from the membership of these bodies, other Member States too may fail to implement many of the decisions taken by these bodies. A look at the implementation reports from Member States, available on the web site of the sanctions committees, indicates how outdated they are; in most cases they are of the 2003 vintage. We welcome the Council's adoption of a new procedure for the selection of the Chairs of subsidiary bodies. We hope it is a harbinger of greater change in the subterranean universe in its totality.

Let me detail the second aspect, which relates to the lack of institutionalized interaction and consultation between the Council and troop- and police-contributing countries. This is a staple issue since the Brahimi report (S/2000/809) was issued in 2000. More recently, on 31 December 2015, the Council adopted presidential statement S/PRST/2015/26, in which it noted that the lack of effective dialogue among the Council, Secretariat and troop-contributing countries (TCCs) had generated frustration on all sides and undermined mandate implementation.

Yet let us look at the recent example of developments concerning the United Nations peacekeeping mission in South Sudan in the same six-month period. There has been talk and suggestions about increasing the number of troops, of a possible expansion of mandate, deployment of a rapid action brigade, measures for protection of civilians and calls for an arms embargo. At no stage have there been efforts at institutionalized consultations with TCCs on any of these topics, as my country, the largest troop-contributor to this peacekeeping operation, can vouch. Consultations among Council, Secretariat and troop-contributing countries remains an improvement that many have asked for in various forums but which remains to be implemented years after their necessity was acknowledged. I would ask now: when will its time will come?

The two areas mentioned by my delegation today exemplify the chasm that exists between the Council's working methods and the general membership's wishes for comprehensive structural-functional reform. Despite this chasm, however, India is committed to pursuing the quest for far-reaching reform in order to make the Council fit for purpose for the twenty-first century.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Hungary.

Ms. Bogyay (Hungary): We would all like to see a more efficient, transparent and relevant Security Council that provides solutions — and not culs de sac — for all of us. In order to join forces in trying to find ways and means to form a more effective Council, let me reiterate Hungary's views while fully supporting the statements delivered previously on behalf of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency (ACT) group.

I thank Japan for providing us with the opportunity to reflect on this very important topic.

Hungary naturally welcomes resolution 69/321, adopted by consensus by the General Assembly, on 11 September 2015, on the revitalization of the work of the General Assembly. The resolution has set up a structured process for the selection of the next Secretary-General. So far, the publication of candidates and the informal dialogues have been conducted successfully and have yielded interesting results. I would like to congratulate the Presidents of the General Assembly and of the Security Council for their successful cooperation. We hope that this transparent and inclusive process will be fully implemented and completed on time. However, we would like to see a more transparent process during the straw polls as well.

Hungary supports measures that further strengthen the relationship between the Security

Council and the General Assembly. We would like the relationship between the two main bodies of the United Nations to continue to improve in terms of greater transparency and consistency. We therefore suggest making more effective use of already existing tools and the further development of current practices and measures. We would like to suggest that the Security Council submit an analytical, substantive and comprehensive evaluation of its work in the annual report to the General Assembly. We would like to see the Council continue expanding consultations and cooperation to include non-Council Member States, in particular troop- and police-contributing countries and regional organizations.

The Council, we think, should increase the number of its public meeetings, interactive briefings, informal interactive dialogues and Arria Formula meetings. The Council should hold more wrap-up sessions to improve the flow of substantive information and understanding of the Council's positions within the wider membership. We believe that the Council should use existing tools to prevent mass atrocities. We advocate voluntary refraining from the use of the veto in cases of mass atrocities and encourage all Member States that have not yet done so to support the so-called code of conduct elaborated by the ACT group and signed by 112 Member States so far.

The role of the International Criminal Court is vital to ending impunity and bringing perpetrators to justice when national criminal accountability mechanisms are not available. The Security Council therefore has a special role to play under the Rome Statute as it can refer situations of States not party to the Statute to the Court in order to hold perpetrators to account. The Security Council should utilize its referral power in a consistent manner.

Hungary would also like to see the Council engage in clear-cut communications and able to translate its work clearly to the outside world.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Italy.

Mr. Cardi (Italy): As it has relevance to working methods, allow me to briefly outline the agreement we reached on 28 June with the Netherlands to split the 2017-2018 term on the Security Council, with Italy serving the first year and the Kingdom of the Netherlands to serve in 2018, pending by-elections. I am happy to mention this issue also on behalf of the Netherlands.

We are currently defining our cooperation around shared goals and values in the firm belief that this agreement sends a positive political message of cooperation to tackle common challenges and contribute to improving the work of the Council. In this regard, Italy and the Netherlands will be guided by such principles as safeguarding the effectiveness of the Council and the action of its elected members, ensuring as much continuity as possible; avoiding duplication, and using every opportunity before January to prepare our term, in the spirit of the joint paragraph. In addition, allow me to make a few other specific remarks.

My first remark is on the link between the transparency, openness and inclusiveness of the Council and its own effectiveness. The former are a means to achieve more of the latter, of course. Having served in New York in the 1990s, I can testify that much has been achieved in terms of the greater transparency and openness of this organ.

Further specific improvements can be sought, such as more frequent informal, Toledo-style wrap-up sessions, which allow greater interaction with the membership on the work of the month. The attendance and interaction achieved in these meetings are a sign of their popularity and usefulness to non-Council members. We should make more effective use of open meetings, such as informal interactive dialogues and Arria Formula meetings, and continue to increase the focus and interactivity of open debates, involving, as appropriate, non-governmental actors, especially from civil society. We must increase coordination, cooperation and interaction with the other principal organs, in particular the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), and expand, as appropriate, interaction with troop- and police-contributing countries during the course of the mandate of a mission. We should also expand consultation and cooperation with regional and subregional organizations, including by inviting relevant organizations to participate in the Council's private and public meetings, as appropriate.

My second remark concerns the preventive action of the Council, a specific tool at the disposal of this organ under section XI of note S/2010/507, concerning Council missions. We take positive note of their increased number and underline their value — and that of the missions of the PBC country configurations — for understanding and assessing particular situations on the agenda of the Council.

My third remark refers to section XIII of the aforementioned note, concerning newly elected members. Italy welcomes the fact that the Council is taking full advantage of the elections being moved forward to June by also adequately moving forward the invitation to newly elected members to attend meetings of the Council. In this regard, Italy welcomes the Council's commitment to agreeing provisionally on the appointment of Chairs of the subsidiary organs no later than 1 October. In light of the arrangement to split the mandate with the Netherlands, the adoption of the note by the President S/2016/619 will certainly help new members to be effective on the Council from day one.

We look forward to an updated and improved note on the Council's working methods as a useful guide for our future action in this organ.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Poland.

Mrs. Duda-Plonka (Poland): I thank you, Sir, for convening today's debate. As requested by the presidency, my contribution to the discussion will be concise. We have identified three issues with respect to the Security Council's working methods that we consider to be of utmost importance and would like to highlight today.

First, we note the advantages of the penholdership system, with special emphasis on the effectiveness of the work of the Council. We are, however, concerned that by allowing the de facto monopolization of the drafting of documents, we voluntarily give up some of the advantages of diversity and creativity. All members of the Security Council, including non-permanent members, should engage in the drafting process at all stages and contribute to issues of interest to them. In this context, we refer to note S/2014/268 and call for change of the arrangement so as to ensure more equal division of the penholder responsibility.

Secondly, building on the debate held in February 2016 on the working methods of Security Council's subsidiary organs (see S/PV.7633), as well as previous debates on this issue, we would like to urge the members of the Security Council, including the Chairpersons of the subsidiary bodies, to continue to work on the implementation of notes S/2012/937, S/2014/393 and S/2016/170. We believe that a more balanced, transparent, efficient and inclusive procedure, as well as the earlier appointment of the Chairpersons of the subsidiary organs, will benefit us all. We also see the value of continuity in the work of the Security Council's subsidiary bodies, ensured by informal briefings and meetings organized by the outgoing chairmanship.

Thirdly, while most of us agree that the focus of the work of the Security Council should shift more in the direction of conflict prevention, we still see a shortage of effective instruments serving that purpose. In this context, we would like to call on the Security Council and the Secretariat to revive the format of horizon-scanning briefings by the Department of Political Affairs on issues of concern.

As we approach the start of the process of considering candidacies for the post of Secretary-General by the Security Council, I also take this opportunity to appeal to Security Council members to maintain the level of transparency, openness and inclusivity and the spirit of dialogue that have prevailed so far in the process of selecting the Secretary-General.

There are many more points that we would wish to make today. We trust, however, that that they will be brought to the attention of the Council by other speakers. I would therefore like to conclude by thanking Japan and other able chairs of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters throughout the years for their outstanding work and contribution to a more effective, transparent and accountable Security Council.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Germany.

Mr. Braun (Germany): Mindful of your request for brevity, Sir,I would like to briefly make the following three points:

First, we welcome the Council's efforts to increase its transparency, inclusiveness and efficiency. We appreciate Japan's initiative to consolidate and streamline note 507 on the Council's working methods. We welcome the note S/2016/619, on the preparation of newly elected members of the Council and the selection of chairs of the Council's subsidiary bodies. We support the practice of holding more frequent open debates, as well as Arria Formula meetings and wrap-up sessions. We encourage the Security Council to further engage in substantive and detailed briefings on its ongoing activities, as well as in the documentation and publication of decisions and other relevant matters.

Secondly, Germany reiterates its support for the French-Mexican initiative on voluntary veto restraint

and the code of conduct of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency group on Security Council action against genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes.

Thirdly, we consider the International Criminal Court as a crucial institution in fighting impunity and pursuing justice. We therefore stress the importance of increased cooperation and information-sharing between the Security Council and the International Criminal Court in order to enable them to work together effectively and fulfil their mandates.

In conclusion, we consider it to be very important to improve the Council's working methods, but we also urgently need a comprehensive, structural reform of the Security Council. We were encouraged to see points of convergence emerge among Member States during this year's intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform with regard to all five reform pillars. However, that convergence has not been consolidated in an updated framework document comprising the original positions of Member States. It is crucial to continue to find common ground on all five key issues during the next negotiations and to move straight into text-based negotiations.

The President: I now give the floor to the reprsentative of Australia.

Ms. Bird (Australia): The scale and pace of challenges facing the Security Council today must bolster our resolve to ensure that the Council is as agile and effective as possible. I will focus on three key areas of working methods reform, namely, transparency, the use of the veto, and early warning and prevention of conflict.

First, Australia firmly believes that transparency is an important element of the Council's effectiveness. Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations enshrines the responsibility of the Security Council to act on behalf of the United Nations membership as a whole. In line with that, Council members should engage regularly with the broader membership through briefings with regional groups and outreach to affected countries. We also support greater use of public meetings, open debates, Arria Formula meetings and monthly wrap-up sessions. When much of the Council's work involves or relies on non-members' ability to implement its decisions, it is imperative that the broader membership be engaged appropriately in Council deliberations.

Secondly, we must move urgently, decisively and in unison to agree on clear limitations on the veto. Too often, the Council has failed in its mandate because narrow interests have been allowed to prevail over those of the most vulnerable. We therefore join others in calling on all Council members — current and incoming — to commit unambiguously to the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency group's code of conduct and the complementary French-Mexican initiative on limiting the use of the veto in situations of mass atrocity.

Thirdly, the Council must become better at predicting and preventing the escalation or relapse into conflict. We all have a responsibility in that regard. Frank, timely and independent assessments from the Secretariat on situations where populations are at risk are crucial to that. Briefings by the Secretary-General's Special Advisers on the Prevention of Genocide and on the Responsibility to Protect are valuable in ensuring the Council is well placed to prevent mass atrocities. We urge Council members to reinstate regular horizon-scanning briefings on potential emerging conflicts. As we well know, human rights abuses are often a precursor to conflict. In that light, we commend the Secretary-General on driving change through his Human Rights Up Front initiative, and we encourage him to make greater use of his prerogative under Article 99 of the Charter to bring such situations to the Council's attention.

In conclusion, as we continue to grapple with multiple, overlapping challenges of terrorism, instability, conflict and fragility, working methods reform is not just a bureaucratic exercise; it is critical to the ability of the Council to discharge its core mandate — and to the lives that depend on it.

The President: I now give the floor to the reprsentative of Romania.

Mr. Jinga (Romania): I would like to express our appreciation for the work Japan has performed as Chair of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions, particularly the measures to enhance the Security Council's efficiency, transparency and interactivity. The comprehensive presidential note S/2010/507 has contributed to making the work of the Security Council more effective and transparent.

As preceding speakers have done, and as requested in the concept note (S/2016/585, annex) prepared for

this open debate, I will streamline my intervention to cover three topics related to the working methods of the Security Council.

First, with regard to transparency, the Security Council is responsible for its methods of work, and it is up to the Council to modify them. At the same time, the entire United Nations membership has conferred upon the Council the primary responsibility for preserving international peace and security. The Council acts on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations, and its decisions must be implemented by 193 countries. That is why the Council's working methods represent an issue that concerns the entire United Nations membership.

Significant progress has been achieved in the past couple of years in adapting the methods of work to the new global realities, and the Council has proved to be both creative and flexible when a new tool for handling a particular situation was necessary. Although that positive evolution was driven by specific needs, and not by a thematic reform, I think that using ad hoc innovations in specific cases seems to be a realistic approach. In that respect, improvements have been made on the issue of communication with full membership — through open debates and briefings, wrap-up sessions, the announcement of various types of meetings in *The Journal of the United Nations*, the early circulation of draft resolutions and notifications about the Council's emergency meetings.

Yet we need more time to hear from people on the ground, including through informal formats such as Arria Formula meetings, which provide a tool for the Council to get views beyond those of Member States. Greater transparency is also necessary in the functioning of the Security Council's subsidiary organs, which should be encouraged to further interact with the United Nations membership on topics related to peacekeeping, conflict prevention and sanctions.

Secondly, with regard to the use of working methods in conflict prevention, there is broad consensus on the need to enhance our efforts on prevention, given the recognition that, in conflicts like in medicine, preventing is more efficient and less expensive than healing. As the Security Council's activity is not only about ending conflicts, but also about avoiding future ones, it is important to connect the Council's work on peace and security to the development agenda, because, as we know, there is no peace without development and there is no development without lasting peace.

Consolidating the Security Council's role in prevention by strengthening early-warning mechanisms — such as horizon-scanning briefings — briefings on threats and informal interactive dialogues can play an essential role in detecting emerging threats to peace and security. More interaction with regional organizations, troop- and police-contributing countries, Special Representatives of the Secretary-General and High Commissioners, the International Criminal Court and the International Court of Justice would also contribute to conflict prevention.

Thirdly, discussions about the working methods must be placed within the broader context of Security Council reform. We may have different views on this topic, but the reality is that, without identifying a common denominator to channel the debate on Council reform, dissatisfaction and even frustration among Member States could divert the process into a less positive direction, with the risk of affecting the credibility of the United Nations.

We all need a strong Council that continues to play a decisive role in preserving peace and security around the globe. In 1946, when the United Nations was created, there were 50 founding countries, while today the Organization includes 193 Member States. In 1946, the world population was 2.5 billion; today we are 7.3 billion people on Earth. The Council's composition should reflect that new geopolitical and demographic reality.

Therefore, we believe that must continue to search for a constructive solution on Security Council reform, while fully respecting the Charter of the United Nations. At important moments, the Council has shown inspiration and flexibility. We have to rediscover those ingredients.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Chile.

Mr. Barros Melet (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): We thank Japan for convening this debate and for its excellent leadership of the Council's work and of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters.

Chile supports the statement made by the representatives of the Islamic Republic of Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and of

Switzerland on behalf of Accountability, Coherence and Transparency group, to which we belong. We shall therefore address three key areas that our recent experience in the Council recommends for improving interactivity, decision-making outcomes, inclusion and accountability.

Concerning the repertoire of initiatives, the general rule must be the selection of priority themes or those relating to necessary preventive actions, avoiding the misuse of the Council for purposes outside its functions. Public debates should be oriented by concept notes focused on promoting exchanges of ideas with clear objectives to prevent unnecessary rhetoric. The concept note prepared for this debate (S/2016/585, annex) is a good example of that.

Procedural economy should not be at the expense of diversity. Accordingly, we recommend that joint statements of members of the Council be issued with caution. Collective formats should not replace the individual role of the elected members, whose opinions provide necessary perspectives that are often left out of group declarations, thereby hindering inclusive decision-making.

Chile firmly supports the convening of formal and public wrap-up sessions in the Chamber, with the participation of all Council members. That format provides an official record and translation, which ensure transparency, the dissemination of the Council's work and its statistical analysis, which is conducive to accountability. Such meetings should be oriented to public evaluation and as a projection of emerging issues, and constitute an important instrument for the participation of the elected 10, and should therefore be safeguarded. With regard to their frequency, these meetings should take place at least at the beginning and end of the membership of the elected 10 in order to provide a space where they can share their priorities and assess their tenures. The use of these meetings could be enhanced through concept notes promoting assessment and foresight. The January wrap-up session (see S/PV.7616), under the presidency of Uruguay, was a successful example.

It is only through familiar formats and clear rules that we will guarantee the transparency and accountability of this organ. While we support the informal briefings convened by the presidency, they should not replace the formal wrap- up sessions but reinforce and complement them. We note with concern the tendency to confuse these complementary formats, as informal briefings are primarily an instrument for the accountability primarily of each presidency, while the formal wrap-up is a collective and public work of the Council as a whole.

We call for the process of drafting resolutions and statements of the presidency include the permanent and elected members. In the case of items related to subsidiary bodies, that can be ensured through a greater role given to the respective Vice-Chairs. We reiterate that the Council's work must be inspired by transparency, fine-tuning and close cooperation with the General Assembly, including in regard to the appointment of the Secretary-General, thereby ensuring an open and inclusive process leading to the adoption of decisions on this issue and the drafting of the appointment by the General Assembly.

To close, although the use of the veto does not constitute a method of work in itself, it has negative repercussions on the unity of the Council and its work, perpetuating the imbalance of power between the permanent and elected members.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Guatemala.

Mr. Sandoval Cojulún (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): We appreciate the convening of this open debate on the working methods of the Council and the concept note prepared for this meeting (S/2016/585, annex). We trust that our deliberations will not only allow us to renew our commitment to ongoing progress in improving the efficiency, transparency and interactivity of the Security Council, but will also serve as a solid foundation for the effective updating of the note by the President S/2010/507.

We recognize the progress made in some practices and in the strengthening of other measures included in note S/2010/507 and successive notes of the presidency, thanks to the commendable work of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters. However, taking into account our own experience as a non-permanent member of the Security Council for the period 2012-2013, we believe that there is still room for improvement, and we highlight three issues of current relevance to the working methods of the Security Council.

First, the quest for information and understanding regarding the Council's activities remains a

fundamental and legitimate one. Although there has been an increase in the number of public meetings, the ongoing convening of open debates that promote the greater participation of non-members of the Council, and, in recent years, the holding of numerous meetings under the Arria Formula, we regret the increasingly rare wrap-up sessions and the lack of regular contact with the Peacebuilding Commission — an advisory body of the Council that plays an important role in preventing the recurrence of conflicts — and the Chairs of its country-specific configurations, as well as other United Nations bodies.

Secondly, the Council has in the past taken decisions on the appointment of the Chairmen of the subsidiary bodies in a balanced, transparent and inclusive manner that has promoted change, because there is the impression that closed consultations are held on the process, especially with respect to newly elected Council members. My delegation hopes that this practice and trend will be strengthened in the future. It is also necessary to ensure that the selection and appointment processes for the various panels of expert are more transparent and balanced in order to promote the broadest possible geographical representation, bearing in mind the guidance provided in presidential note S/2006/997.

We also attach priority to ongoing improvement ofthe interaction between the subsidiary bodies — the Committees and informal working groups — with all Member States. In that regard, we welcome initiatives such as the open formal consultations on the comprehensive review of the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004), held by the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) in June.

Thirdly, I refer to the selection and appointment process for the next Secretary-General, particularly General Assembly resolution 69/321, which we believe contributes to greater transparency and greater inclusiveness in this process, with clear guidelines, such as the joint letter of the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council, in which they outline and explain the procedure. The ongoing flow of information about the candidates and the holding of informal dialogues and meetings with candidates are also of enormous importance. All of this will have promote the deeper involvement of our membership, which I think is evident as a fundamental aspect of our goal.

Since the issuance of presidential note S/2010/507, the Council has adopted a dozen notes, but their implementation often yield unsatisfactory or contradictory results. To facilitate such follow-up, we would welcome the proposal contained in the concept note of working on a comprehensive document under the format of a presidential note to update note 507 to consolidate and compile all of the decisions taken on working methods. We look forward to its publication and dissemination to all Member States. We trust that such a document would take into account the criticisms and proposals made today and in previous debates, wit the working methods of the Council being closely linked to accountability to the broader membership of the Organization. Past practice indicates that the elected members are accountable to the regional groups and to all Member States of the United Nations are those who tend most often to improve working methods of the Council. The best way to highlight the representative and democratic nature of the Council is to strengthen accountability standards and transparency. That, along with the cooperation of permanent members, will lead to greater synergy in the Council as it seeks to achieve its common goal of improving its working methods.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Georgia.

Mr. Imnadze (Georgia): Let me also join other to express our gratitude to you, Mr. President, for convening this meeting.

We all agree on the need to streamline the working methods, but the years that have passed since 2007, despite some progress, have shown the many difficulties in achieving convergence of Member States' positions to overcome the structural shortcomings of the Security Council vis-à-vis the emerging global threats and challenges. A more expeditious arrival at a comprehensive package is absolutely necessary, whereas further delay will continue to put the Council at further risk of becoming either inadequate or dilatory in responding to existing or emerging global challenges and threats to international peace and security. We very much hope that in the coming months, in accordance with the statement by the President, the Informal Working Group intends to work towards a comprehensive document in the form of an updated presidential note S/2010/507 that would consolidate all decisions on working methods, with the fuller participation by the broader membership in relevant discussions.

Georgia believes that a more focused and succinct discussion in the open debate format must be viewed as an important tool in improving and democratizing the working methods of the Security Council. A meaningful streamlining of the working methods should also imply the reform of the use of the veto, the modalities and decision-making principles of the Security Council and more accountability before the General Assembly.

Given our own experience, we already formally endorsed — and here I also want to reiterate our full support for — the joint French-Mexican proposal with regard to the use of the veto in the Security Council, as well as the initiative introduced by Liechtenstein on a code of conduct with regard to Security Council action against genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes. When I said our own experience, I do not mean a theoretical exercise but an actual and unfortunate fact — when a permanent member of the Security Council, while being a party to a conflict, with a single-handed veto, terminated the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia. We faced a paradoxical scenario that, when a security presence was most needed right after a full-scale war, the United Nations withdrew. As aftermath, 20 per cent of my country's territory remains under illegal foreign military occupation following waves of ethnic cleansing.

We should all learn from such examples. Therefore, Georgia believes that the right to the veto should be restricted under the following circumstances: first, when a decision of the Security Council aims at preventing crimes against humanity, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and genocide; and, secondly, when a Permanent Member is involved in the conflict under consideration, and, therefore cannot exercise its rights impartially.

In conclusion, let me once again express our firm support for this process. We participated in the previous discussions, and we are determined to continue to contribute to this very important process.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Singapore.

Mr. Teo (Singapore): Singapore aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

We express our appreciation to Japan for its long and consistent leadership on this important topic. It was under Japan's chairmanship of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters in 2006 that presidential note S/2006/507 was first issued. Note 507 was updated in 2010, again under Japan's chairmanship. The tenth anniversary of note 507 is a fitting time to consider the progress we have made.

However, progress is a relative concept. The number of steps taken forward must also be measured against the length of the journey, and how far we have come from the starting point. On this, my delegation is pleased to note that there has been good progress in transparency, aided by developments in technology. There have been an increasing number of open debates and informal briefings on the work of the Council to the wider United Nations membership since note 507 was first issued, 10 years ago. More meetings are webcast. More information is disseminated now through the Council's website, *The Journal of the United Nations* and on social media platforms.

Nevertheless, transparency is not an end in itself. It is a means to promote accountability and more effective action by the Council. In that context, more visibility does not necessarily lead to greater credibility. Formulaic statements at open debates, where known positions are regurgitated, do little to effect improvements on the ground. We therefore appreciate Japan's commitment to taking on board views expressed today, and encourage the Council to engage more meaningfully with the wider United Nations membership, especially affected countries and regional organizations, during informal briefings and Arria Formula meetings. That would enhance the quality of discussions and strengthen substantive engagement between the Council and the General Assembly, which would represent a major step towards true transparency and accountability. There are a number of other areas of concern to us that are not specifically listed in note 507 that we wish to raise.

First, a practical step that the Council could consider to increase transparency and accountability is to adopt its rules of procedure. Today marks a little over 70 years that the Council first adopted its provisional rules of procedure. In other words, they have been provisionally applied for far longer than most of diplomats who sit on the Council have been in service. Surely it is time for the Council to finally adopt its own rules of procedure. That would be a small, but vital, step towards demonstrating the Council's commitment to transparency and accountability.

Secondly, in terms of effectiveness, there have been examples of how the Council has managed to respond, or not, to critical developments. The record has been mixed. Too often in the past, the veto has been used to prevent action to address crimes of atrocity, at the cost of many innocent lives. We are therefore happy to note that there is growing support and movement in favour of limiting the use of the veto in cases of mass atrocities. Approximately 100 countries have supported the French-Mexican initiative calling on the five permanent members of the Security Council to voluntarily and collectively pledge not to use the veto in cases of recognized mass atrocities. An even greater number of 112 countries, including my own delegation and eight members of the Security Council, including two permanent members, have also supported the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency Group's initiative on a code of conduct on Security Council action against genocide, crimes against humanity or war crimes. Singapore reiterates its call to the permanent members of the Council to refrain from using a veto to block Council action aimed at preventing or ending genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. If they have to, they should explain to the wider United Nations membership why they cannot support initiatives aimed at preventing or ending mass atrocities. Such a requirement will serve to make the Council more accountable to the wider membership and the international community for its action, or inaction.

Finally, it is our hope that further steps will be taken towards promoting inclusiveness in the Council's work. We are encouraged by the conduct to date, under the leadership of the President of the General Assembly, of the process of selecting the next Secretary-General. We hope that the Council will work with the President of the General Assembly to maintain the strong spirit of transparency and inclusiveness in the process that we have seen thus far. In that regard, we note that the Council will soon conduct its first informal straw poll to select the next Secretary-General. However, we regret to hear from the President of the General Assembly that the outcome of the straw poll will not be communicated to the wider United Nations membership.

We therefore join the President of the General Assembly and other Member States in urging the Council to communicate more openly with the General Assembly on that very important issue, in line with the new standard of openness and transparency introduced into the process by the President of the General Assembly. Singapore welcomes such opportunities as this open debate to discuss the important issue of the working methods of the Security Council. Under Japan's leadership, we look forward to a meaningful outcome that will help to strengthen the Council's effectiveness and credibility, as well as its engagement with the broader United Nations membership.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Estonia.

Ms. Lind (Estonia): As a member of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency (ACT) Group, Estonia fully endorses the statement delivered by the representative of Switzerland. Together with Costa Rica, Estonia has been at the forefront of the ACT group on the issue of appointing the next Secretary-General. I would therefore like to emphasize a few points on that subject.

Throughout the current process — whose transparency and inclusiveness have been historic — which has successfully sought to implement General Assembly resolution 69/321, we have witnessed the importance of effective and substantive communication between the Security Council and the wider membership. In that regard, we consider the monthly meetings between the President of the Security Council and the President of the General Assembly and the reports from those meetings to be very useful. In particular, the General Assembly hearings, which, for the first time, allow all Members of the Organization and a global audience to assess candidates, attest to the Member States' dedication to the vision set out by the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations in 1945, that the Secretary-General, more than anyone else, should stand for the United Nations as a whole.

As a member of the ACT group, Estonia has encouraged candidates to participate in all elements of the selection process. The General Assembly proceedings have been successful, and the Security Council is planning to hold its first straw poll for the candidates in a few days. We have emphasized the need for the Security Council to keep the General Assembly informed of any developments, and have encouraged regular and close communication between the Presidents of both organs. We expect that the overall change in the process will bring with it an updated approach by the Security Council. Furthermore, we are entering the most decisive phase of the selection process, and would like to see it conclude successfully.

We would also like to recall that it is the General Assembly's prerogative to prepare the final draft resolution on the appointment of the Secretary-General. It is our understanding that a discussion of the elements to be included in that draft resolution will be taking place in the General Assembly soon. For us, in addition to creating a more inclusive process and broader ownership — in line with present-day expectations — the aim has been to strengthen the institution of the Office of the Secretary-General by making it more representative. We hope that the culmination of the selection process will be as encouraging as the whole process has been so far.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Liechtenstein.

Mr. Wenaweser (Liechtenstein): In addition to the points reflected in the statement delivered earlier today on behalf of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency (ACT) Group, of which we are a member, we would like to contribute the following brief points on the working methods of the Security Council.

We value the efforts made by the Council over the past few years, as reflected in presidential note S/2010/507 and the update thereof (S/2016/619). Taken together, those measures have led to real improvements by creating more transparency and accountability in the Council's work; however, their implementation often remains inconsistent.

Technical and practical improvements are important. We will continue working with others to propose meaningful changes to the Council in order to further improve its performance. In particular, we would like to encourage an open process in the appointment of the Chairs of subsidiary bodies — a change that, in our view, would be a long-awaited improvement. We also believe that the most meaningful change that the Council can make would be in the way that it handles some of its biggest tasks, in which the entire membership has a direct stake. I would like to highlight three of those key challenges.

First, the Council's reputation has been undermined by its inability to prevent and effectively respond to mass atrocities. The failures in Srebrenica and Rwanda are permanent stains on the Council's record. In spite of all the calls of "never again", little has happened in practice. The case of Syria in particular illustrates on a daily basis the continued paralysis and dysfunctional nature of the Council in the face of a situation that is destabilizing an entire region and that is characterized by the systematic commission of mass atrocities by the parties to the conflict.

Therefore, the code of conduct on mass atrocities formulated by the ACT group, and mentioned frequently in today's debate, provides a sign of hope. It has been supported by 112 States. We call on the rest of the membership to support that important political commitment, and we look forward to discussing its implementation with Council members and the relevant entities in the Secretariat. We also look forward to tangible progress in the French-Mexican initiative on restrictions in the use of the veto in dealing with situations involving mass atrocities.

Secondly, the process of appointing the next Secretary-General has generated considerable interest beyond the confines of this building, not least because of the significantly improved process in the General Assembly. For the first time, the entire membership has an opportunity to engage with the candidates publicly and to assess their qualifications at first hand. Important as those steps are, they must be matched by the Security Council's handling of its part in the appointment process. As a first step, the results of the informal voting rounds, in which the Council will start engaging this week, should be made transparent for the benefit of the entire membership.

However, the manner in which the Council frames its recommendation to the General Assembly for the latter's final consideration of the draft resolution appointing the Secretary-General will be of the utmost importance. For the sake of institutional balance, the Council should limit its recommendation to one or more names for consideration by the Assembly. In turn, the Assembly should forge an agreement on such elements as the duration of the mandate, whether the mandate should consist of a single term — as we believe it should – and on other issues that we hope will be identified in the course of the next week.

Finally, we would like to emphasize the need for the Council to perform more effectively its role as enforcer of accountability for the most serious crimes under international law. In situations such as that of Syria, but also in many other post-conflict situations, the Council should ask for accountability as part of a reconciliation process that can lead to long-term stability and peace. Where it is possible and realistic, the countries in question should be offered assistance

with their efforts to ensure such accountability under their national systems, with the help of international entities where necessary.

Referrals to the International Criminal Court are of course also an option for the Council, provided that they be accompanied by genuine political will to ensure accountability, instead of being the result of transient political expediency. The referrals made thus far have produced very limited results and have been a mixed blessing, both for the victims of the crimes in question and for the Court itself.

The President: I should like to inform all delegations concerned that, taking into account the limited number of speakers remaining, thanks to the efficient use of time so far, I will not suspend this open debate for lunch as planned earlier. It is my intention to continue until the last speaker.

I now give the floor to the representative of Costa Rica.

Mr. Mendoza-García (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): Costa Rica would like to thank you and your delegation, Sir, for having convened this important open debate and for your leadership of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters.

Costa Rica aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Switzerland on behalf of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency Group, which has contributed very responsibly to the discussion on various aspects of the activities of the Security Council.

We live in a time when transparency in decision-making processes and the accountability of representatives to those whom they represent are based on increasingly solid principles of organization. Presidential note S/2010/507, in its updated form, marks an important landmark in the history of the Security Council, above all with regard to transparency. The note addresses many of the concerns of the Organization's Members and resolves some of them, at least conceptually.

We welcome the progress made in the past year on very important issues such as documentation; the election — six-months earlier than in earlier years — of the non-permanent members of the Security Council; the selection process for the next Secretary-General, which has promoted the transparency and participation of Member States and civil society; the call for more monthly open debates on cross-cutting topics that are important to all Members; wrap-up sessions aimed at sharing details on the Council's monthly work with all Member States; and the monthly publication of the Council's programme of work.

Nevertheless, a review of the Council's practices also leads us to conclude that the challenges involved in implementing the agreements and rules that have been adopted still persist. For example, Costa Rica is of the view that the Council should pay more attention to the inputs of those with legitimate interests in, or who are affected by, the Council's decisions. Similarly, there should be more direct and transparent communication between the Council and its subsidiary bodies and with the rest of the Organization.

The actions of the Security Council are increasingly in the public domain, but we are still far from the spirit of the guideline set forth in the rule that states that, unless it decides otherwise, the Security Council shall meet in public. In that connection, we believe that it is imperative to finally and formally adopt the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, with a view to increasing transparency and accountability and regulating and ending the excessively discretionary nature of the Council's actions.

We reiterate the need to improve relations, communication and cooperation among the General Assembly, other relevant bodies and the Council, without overstepping the mandates set forth for each of those bodies in the Charter of the United Nations, in order to work together to safeguard international peace and security.

We also need greater transparency in the work of subsidiary bodies. Additionally, it is important to continue promoting improvements in the drafting of the Security Council's annual report to the General Assembly by involving Member States in an informal and interactive debate during both the drafting and the presentation to the Assembly. Moreover, the Council's report should contain more analytical discussion of its daily work and should not be a mere description of the work being carried out.

Finally, we emphasize the need to continue our efforts to delineate the limitations on the use of the veto, such as its prohibited use in cases of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and massive violations of human rights, as proposed by the Accountability, Coherence, Transparency Group in its code of conduct.

My delegation underscores its conviction that the working methods of the Security Council are a fundamental aspect of its comprehensive reform. The implementation of the agreed-upon measures to improve the Council's working methods and the inclusion of new measures will lend greater effectiveness to the Council's actions and will contribute to its transparency and accountability. We are therefore convinced that a substantive reform of the working methods will help us remove obstacles that sometimes prevent the Security Council from entirely fulfilling its mandate as enshrined in the Charter and strain the Council's relationship with other organs.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Observer of the Holy See to the United Nations.

Archbishop Auza: My delegation wishes to thank Japan's presidency for convening this annual open debate on the working methods of the Security Council.

Without a doubt, the Council deserves our profound gratitude and appreciation for its efforts to preserve nations and peoples from the scourge of war and conflict in the course of its almost 71 years of existence. Reform and adaptation to the times are, however, always necessary to make the Council as fit as possible for its purpose. States Members of the United Nations and various sectors of civil society have increasingly been calling for reform to render the Council more transparent, more efficient, more effective, more accountable and more representative.

There have been criticisms that national and geopolitical interests override the Security Council's primary function, which is to maintain international peace and security. To quell criticisms and suspicions of a self-serving Council, a key feature of a reformed Council would be a commitment by all Members States not to vote, while they serve as members of the Council, against a credible draft resolution before the Council on timely and decisive action to prevent or end the commission of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes. That would necessarily include a commitment on the part of the Council's permanent members to refrain from casting a veto in situations where such crimes are involved.

In that context, the United Nations in general and the Council in particular would acquire greater legitimacy and authority if they could establish clear and effective criteria for the application of the principle of the responsibility to protect. In that regard, my delegation believes that, in situations where evident crimes of genocide, mass atrocities and war crimes are being committed, the action of the international community should not be interpreted as an unwarranted imposition on or limitation of the sovereignty of States, provided that the action being proposed respected the juridical means established in the United Nations Charter and other international legal instruments.

In order to maintain and further consolidate the Council's authority, it would be opportune to seriously consider the calls of Member States for a Council that is more representative and that better reflects present-day geopolitical realities. While appeals for a more representative Council are not necessarily motivated by selfless altruism, and while an enlarged Council would not offer a guarantee of greater efficiency, a more representative Security Council is among the elements of convergence that the majority of the Member States proposed during the informal meetings of the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform held during the seventieth session of the General Assembly. Dismissing or ignoring those elements of convergence would not help the Council's appeal, credibility or authority.

Another element that has constantly emerged from consultations and debates on Security Council reform is the call for greater transparency. That has been getting stronger during the past months, not only in the context of the larger question of reinvigorating the work of the United Nations as it turns 71, but also in the more immediate context of selecting the Organization's next Secretary-General.

The call for greater transparency also includes the need to continue to improve the means and methods of dialogue between the Security Council and the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies and partners. It likewise suggests a reasonable increase in the number of the Council's open debates, while recognizing the great importance of closed consultations.

The need for greater transparency also extends to the working methods and procedures of the Council's subsidiary bodies, particularly the sanctions committees, in order to ensure and strengthen the protection of the fundamental rights of individuals and the rule of law. In that regard, my delegation would like to recall paragraph 109 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome document, on the necessity of ensuring a fair and clear procedure for placing individuals and

entities on sanctions lists, for removing them and for considering humanitarian exemptions.

The reform of the Security Council will require great prudence, wisdom, magnanimity and resolve on the part of all. At the end of the day, any meaningful reform of the Security Council must be guided by its fundamental mission, namely, to effectively ensure international peace and security. When all is said and done, and whatever shape and size it may eventually take, a reformed Council must be better equipped than ever to spare us and future generations from the unspeakable horrors of genocide, mass atrocities, war crimes and other grave violations of fundamental human rights and of international humanitarian law.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Norway.

Mr. Pedersen (Norway): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Nordic countries — Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and my own country, Norway.

I would like to touch on three issues, namely, the selection of the next Secretary-General, how the Security Council can become more open and transparent, and the role of the elected members of the Security Council.

First, with regard to the process of selecting the new Secretary-General, we are pleased to see that the selection process this time is much more open and inclusive, thereby allowing for better scrutiny of the suitability of candidates by Member States and the general public. The cooperation between the General Assembly and the Council on that issue has been remarkable. Through the informal dialogues with the candidates, organized by the President of the General Assembly, candidates have presented their visions for scrutiny by Member States. For the first time in history, an equal number of women and men have declared their candidacy. We urge the Security Council to maintain that openness and transparency all way through the process. There is no turning back to the practices of the past. At a minimum, we expect the Security Council to announce the results of the various straw polls through the President of the General Assembly. We are convinced that the increased transparency and openness that have been introduced into the selection process have already raised and improved the profile of the United Nations.

Secondly, the work of the Security Council should become more accessible. We appreciate that the Council conducts a significant number of its meetings in public, and we encourage it to put measures in place to enable the membership to be effectively informed about the topics discussed under "Any other business" during the closed consultations. There are also ways to improve the information flow. When press statements and presidential statements are adopted, it takes hours, if not days, before they are available on the Security Council's website. It is a necessity that the work of the Council become more accessible for the broader membership and, indeed, the public.

Thirdly, moving the Security Council elections to earlier in the year is an important step that enables incoming members to prepare better for their term as members. We welcome the note adopted by the Council on Friday (S/2016/619), which aims to extend the period during which newly elected members can observe the work of the Council and to make the process for appointing the Chairs of subsidiary organs more timely and transparent. Duly implemented, those amendments to the current procedures will make the transition phase smoother and provide for enhanced participation by the elected members for the overall benefit of the effectiveness, coherence and accountability of the Council.

Finally, we encourage newly elected members to take advantage of the annual workshop organized by Finland, which aims to prepare incoming members for their membership of the Council.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Belgium.

Ms. Frankinet (Beligium) (*spoke in French*): It is my honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Kingdom of Belgium.

Following the recommendations set out in your concept note (S/2016/585, annex), Sir, and mindful of the end goal of improving the Security Council's inclusiveness, transparency and effectiveness and building further on important work that has been done over the past years, I would like to focus on three action-oriented topics.

First, with regard to strengthening procedures in sanctions regimes, which includes ensuring the fairness of those procedures, Belgium and the Netherlands are

part of the Group of Like-minded States on Targeted Sanctions. We would like to draw the Council's attention to the concrete proposals made by the group and set out in the document on fair and clear procedures for a more effective United Nations sanctions system (S/2015/867, annex), which was sent to the Security Council on 12 November 2015. Belgium and the Netherlands would like the Council to consider those proposals in the framework of the review of presidential note S/2010/507.

Secondly, with regard to strengthening the Council's capacity in the area of prevention, we think that it would be worth exploring the revival of the practice of the wrap-up briefings, or coming up with an innovative formula that stimulates reflection and action on the root causes of conflict and the timely consideration of emerging conflicts. Council members could also consider interacting more closely and flexibly with other bodies and individuals working actively on conflict prevention. We are thinking about, among others, the Peacebuilding Commission and its configuration Chairs, the special envoys of regional or subregional organizations and the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities. Arria Formula meetings could also involve more civil society actors working on conflict prevention. In addition, Council members could specifically consider measures to facilitate the use of Article 99 of the Charter of the United Nations as a key mechanism to help the Secretary-General call the attention of the Security Council to any matter that may threaten international peace and security.

Thirdly, with regard to the operationalization of thematic debates, the Netherlands and Belgium believe that the concept notes set forth good practices to be implemented in all thematic debates — first by emphasizing the guidelines aimed at making the debates more succinct and action-oriented and, secondly, by issuing a clear, specific and operational outcome of the debate. To the extent possible and if relevant, operational outcomes of debates could also be pursued in other relevant United Nations forums. For example, the Council adopted a resolution on youth and terrorism at the end of last year (resolution 2250 (2015)). That initiative was followed up in June by a high-level thematic conversation in the General Assembly on children and youth affected by violent extremism.

Finally, I would like to also reiterate the support of Belgium and the Netherlands for initiatives aimed at minimizing the use of the veto. Like others, we firmly believe there should be a moratorium on the use of the veto in cases of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes. We hope that this could be further explored by all Security Council members.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Indonesia.

Mr. Isnomo (Indonesia): We thank you, Sir, for convening this important open debate.

We would like to associate ourselves with the statement delivered by the representative of Iran on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

Since at any given time 178 Member countries of the United Nations are not in the Security Council, it is crucial that the Council function in a manner that makes it transparent, effective and accountable vis-à-vis all United Nations Members. In that regard, Indonesia welcomes the positive actions taken by the Council over the years, such as more open debates, more consultations with the Presidents of the principal organs and sub-organs and also with troop- and police-contributing countries, as well as including voices from multilateral and regional institutions, civil society, non-governmental organizations and the private sector to enrich the discourse.

Flowing from General Assembly resolution 69/321, the joint initiative of the Presidents of the Security Council and General Assembly to make the process for the selection of the next Secretary-General open and consultative is also a milestone step. Furthermore, the fact that elections for non-permanent Council members were held six months in advance was another positive development.

Yet there remains a significant gap between the expectations of the global citizenry, which has entrusted the Council to act on its behalf, and the Council's functioning. First and foremost in that regard is the exercise of the veto or the threat to exercise the veto, which has obstructed necessary action by the Council in the face of mass atrocities and severe violations of international humanitarian law and human rights law on too many occasions. The examples of Palestine and Syria are two such cases. While Indonesia calls for the abolishment of the right of the veto in the Council, in view of the present entrenched realities, it would support steps that would regulate the use of the veto

responsibly. The Council should work out a workable mechanism in that respect.

Secondly, as world conflicts become more complex, the Council must ensure that all stakeholders concerned with United Nations special political missions and peacekeeping operations are consulted properly and that their strengths are harnessed. The recent reviews of United Nations peace operations, peacebuilding and resolution 1325 (2000) have underscored the primacy of prevention, politics, dialogue and regional partnerships. Fundamental to enabling sustainable peace and realizing the aims of these reviews is the Council's deeper and meaningful interaction with relevant stakeholders, including troop- and police- contributing countries. A shared understanding, cooperation and collaboration among them throughout all phases of peace operations are critical. Following the adoption of resolution 2282 (2016) on the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, my delegation also looks forward to a close and robust partnership of the Council with the Peacebuilding Commission and other relevant United Nations and non-United Nations partners.

Thirdly, Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter of the United Nations should be fully implemented by taking into consideration the views of the affected non-member countries. Their perspectives, along with those of regional organizations, can be invaluable in building workable approaches to resolving root causes and advancing reconciliation.

Fourthly, there should be balanced, harmonious and collaborative relations between the Security Council and the General Assembly. Consistent with Article 11 of the Charter, the Council should take into account the recommendations from the Assembly on matters pertaining to international peace and security. In that respect, the Council must not shy away from discussing non-traditional issues that, in today's reality, have proven to have direct and significant linkages to international peace and security, including the issue of development. Suffice it to say that peace and security could not withstand the test of time if development were neglected.

To keep myself within the time limit and the spirit of the concept note (S/2016/585, annex), I would like to conclude by underlining that, as important as the need to improve the Council's working methods and procedures is, better procedures alone are not the solution. The Council must be effective, fair and just in resolving conflicts in accordance with international law, and that will occur when the Council is reformed comprehensively, becoming democratic, accountable and representative of the plurality and realities of the world today. For its part, Indonesia stands ready to contribute to efforts to achieve a comprehensive Security Council reform.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of South Africa.

Mr. Matjila (South Africa): I thank you, Sir, for organizing this open debate on the working methods of the Security Council. I wish to commend Japan for its sustained efforts over the past 10 years in working to improve the working methods of the Security Council, particularly with regard to its work on strengthening presidential note S/2010/507. The note remains a useful guideline in improving the transparency, efficiency and inclusiveness of the Council. The consistent implementation of the provisions of note 507 is key to ensuring its success. South Africa reiterates that the reforms to working methods, as reflected in note 507, as well as the Council's provisional rules of procedure, should become permanent so that this organ can be held accountable and have predictable and transparent rules.

We wish to align ourselves with the statement delivered by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). In addition to the proposals put forward by NAM, I wish to also focus on four practical suggestions, as requested by the concept note for this meeting (S/2016/585, annex), which South Africa believes can further contribute to creating a more effective Security Council.

First, the Council has consistently agreed, including in note 507, to continue to expand consultation and cooperation with regional and subregional organizations, undertaking to invite relevant organizations to participate in its public and private meetings, when appropriate. Additionally, in note 507 the Council commits itself to continuing to informally consult with regional organizations when drafting, inter alia, resolutions, presidential statements and press statements, as appropriate.

During South Africa's presidency of the Security Council in 2012, we championed strengthening strategic cooperation between the Security Council and the African Union (AU) Peace and Security Council, as well as the promotion of the rule of law in conflict and post-conflict situations. The Security Council also

adopted several outcomes, including resolution 2033 (2012), which recognizes that regional organizations are well placed to understand the nuances and complexities of conflicts and that their proximity to a given conflict allows them to directly influence its prevention or resolution. The resolution provides, among other things, concrete action for the Council to undertake to foster a more strategic relationship with the AU.

Currently there are processes under way in Africa to verify the readiness of the African Standby Force to enable the AU to intervene in conflicts within a short time. The AU has the political will and human resources to deploy troops anywhere in the continent, as reflected by the fact that the majority of peacekeeping troops in Africa originate from the continent itself. What is required is the consistent and regular strategic consultation and coordination between the Council and regional bodies, as well as assistance with regard to capacity-building.

Secondly, while there has been significant improvement in consultations between the Council and troop-contributing countries (TCCs), as called for in note 507, we believe that more can be done. In that regard, regular and timeous consultations and coordination between the Council and TCCs are required, specifically when considering new or the renewal of mandates.

Thirdly, the Security Council has committed itself in note 507 to seeking the views of Member States that are parties to a conflict and/or other interested and affected parties. That commitment should be uniformly applied. It would therefore be necessary for the Council, as a matter of principle, to always consult with all relevant parties to the conflict to ensure that the Council has at its disposal all relevant facts before deliberating on a matter.

Fourthly, briefings by the Council's presidency to the general membership at the beginning and end of the month have become a regular occurrence. The Council has agreed that the Council presidency should provide substantive and detailed briefings to Member States in a timely manner, preferably shortly after informal consultations of the whole. We encourage members of the Council to ensure that they maintain this practice to promote transparency and keep Member States informed about its work.

This meeting is being held in the context of the implementation of seminal reforms related to the way in which the United Nations selects and appoints its Secretary-General. South Africa urges the Security Council to provide the membership with regular updates on its consideration of the candidates so as to ensure the transparency and credibility of the process.

In conclusion, the Council should continue to work towards increasing and improving its transparency and accountability, thereby ensuring the greater effectiveness and legitimacy of its work. Furthermore, superficial changes to the working methods do not detract from the fundamental need for a reform of the Council and the expansion of its membership in both the permanent and non-permanent categories. We must therefore speed up the reform of the Council if we are to avoid the further erosion of the legitimacy and credibility of this organ.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Kazakhstan.

Mr. Tumysh (Kazakhstan): I thank the Japanese presidency for convening this open debate, which will help to strengthen the reform process so as to enable the Security Council to more effectively address the unprecedented contemporary threats and challenges that are making many additional demands on it.

As a member-elect, Kazakhstan is committed to the reform of the Security Council and agrees to the steps recommended by the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters in order to promote the greater transparency, inclusiveness, efficiency, accountability and democratization of the Council's work. My delegation would like to underscore the following proposals for further improving the working methods of the Council, building upon the recommendations of presidential note S/2010/507 and other related documents.

It is clear that greater collaboration with the General Assembly would provide valuable insights from Members States neighbouring conflict zones or impacted by conflicts, with a view to plan meaningful interventions and prevent further spillovers. These and many other issues also require an ongoing dialogue between the Presidents of the Security Council and of the General Assembly as well as with the Economic and Social Council and the Secretariat.

My delegation believes that the rule of law should govern not only internal relations within countries but also international relations among members of the

Council. We are of the view that the work of the Council would be greatly enhanced if the annual report of the Council to the General Assembly were more analytical, reflecting complexities along with an assessment of Council deliberations and decisions and the mandates of peacekeeping operations rather than listing summaries of meetings.

In order to plan rapid and appropriate strategies for intervention, an astute examination of conflicts and geopolitical tensions in all of their political, economic and social dimensions is required, together with an evaluation of the direct and indirect role of Member States in facilitating and impeding conflict resolution.

Kazakhstan supports increasing the number of open meetings, briefings and debates and holding informal interactive dialogues rather than closed consultations, which should be structured and focused in such a manner that they can be productive in laying the foundations for the next steps to be taken rather than remain only read-out statements. We fully support the holding of more ongoing consultations between the Council and troop- and police-contributing countries throughout all phases of Council-mandated peacekeeping operations. Having seen the value of Arria Formula meetings, my country intends to hold such sessions during its tenure. We recommend more regular briefings to non-Council members and more wrap-up sessions.

We welcome the note by the President (S/2016/619) dated 15 July 2016 concerning newly elected members during the transitional period between the election and the beginning of their term. The decision that incoming non-permanent members should have the opportunity to observe the work of the Council as of October 2016 will enable them to perform their future role more effectively. Members-elect, in consultation with all other members of the Council, should collectively decide how they will share the chairmanship of committees and working groups, which are presently presided over by the non-permanent members who will be outgoing in 2017.

We concur with other speakers that Council members should agree on the appointment of the Chairs of subsidiary organs for the following year no later than October 2016. Elected members should also be responsible for drafting resolutions and presidential statements. Likewise, the Chairs of committees and working groups should be given the opportunity for co-penholdership together with existing penholders.

Regarding the selection of the next Secretary-General, my delegation recommends that the outcomes of the straw poll and other subsequent procedures be shared with the General Assembly so as to enable it to have a greater say in the selection of a candidate for this high position. There is also a need for joint ongoing consultations between the Presidents of the Council and of the General Assembly.

My delegation also believes that sanctions should be imposed by the Security Council only following a proper assessment of their impact, and that they must not be imposed unilaterally.

Finally, what is most needed is not just reform but a change in attitudes and a true spirit of solidarity. It is clear that the national interests of Member States must be balanced with greater objectivity and global perspectives.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Cuba.

Mrs. Rodríguez Abascal (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): We endorse the statement made by the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Cuba supports a genuine and deep reform of the Security Council that would make it an effective, transparent, representative and democratic body reflecting the evolution of international relations and of the United Nations over the past 70 years.

A key element of Security Council reform is a change to its working methods. While documents have been adopted with the aim of improving the Council's methods of work, including presidential note S/2010/507, greater efforts are required in order to find effective formulas that guarantee a genuine participation of Member States in the Council's work and in its decision-making.

Often measures are adopted that do not take into account the views of all Council members and sometimes not even those of its permanent members. Lack of transparency and exclusionary practices are a constant thread running through the dynamics of the Council's work.

Under Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations, Member States recognize that the Security Council, in carrying out its functions, acts on their behalf. Therefore, the work of the Council is the

collective responsibility of all Member States, and they should be guaranteed genuine participation in the Council's work and decision-making process.

Cuba reiterates that, at the very least, the following changes should be made in the Council's working methods.

The Council should make every effort to achieve broad consensus through the required consultations and negotiations before undertaking any action. No one should be forced to accept a text when considerable differences remain with regard to its contents.

The number of public meetings of the Council must be increased. Closed meetings and informal consultations should be the exception and not the rule. Dialogue and interaction between the Council and the wider United Nations membership must improve. In that regard, we welcome and encourage the continuation of the practice of holding monthly wrap-up sessions, as recent Council presidencies have done.

States that are directly involved or especially affected should always participate in the Council's deliberations on issues that concern them directly, as required under Article 31 of the Charter. The Council's resolutions and presidential statements should reflect the views that have been expressed by Member States and in particular by the State directly concerned or especially affected.

Countries that are non-members of the Council must have access to subsidiary bodies, including the right to participate in their deliberations and to receive sufficient and timely information on their activities.

In order to enhance the transparency and the level of accountability of the Council, a definitive text should be adopted that regulates its work. It is inconceivable that the Council's rules of procedure remain provisional after some 70 years.

The annual reports that the Council is obligated to submit to the General Assembly must truly be analytical in nature and should adequately assess its performance. We reiterate the need for the Council to submit the special reports required of it under the Charter in its Articles 15 and 24, unfortunately, have not yet been issued.

The question of the veto is inextricably linked to the issue of the Council's working methods, in particular its decision-making mechanism. The veto is an anachronistic and anti-democratic privilege that should be eliminated as soon as possible.

We share the concerns expressed with regard to the growing trend of the Security Council to consider issues and assume functions that are outside its remit. This encroaches increasingly on the role entrusted by the Charter to other United Nations organs, particularly the General Assembly.

All too frequently and often prematurely, the Council has been addressing issues that do not necessarily pose an immediate threat to international peace and security, invoking Chapter VII. Indeed, in accordance with the mandate granted by the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council must focus on addressing the most urgent problems that threaten international peace and security. Chapter VII should be invoked, as provided for in the Charter, as a last resort. Another shared concern is the application of double standards and the manipulation of the Council when it comes to the consideration of certain issues under by this organ.

The central focus of this open debate on working methods should contribute to the essential reform and democratization of the Security Council. We aspire to having a representative, democratic, transparent and efficient Security Council that takes into account the views of all Member States, pursuant to the mandate set out in the Charter of the United Nations and the various realities in our world.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Turkey.

Mr. Begeç (Turkey): Working methods is an issue with direct impact on the critical undertakings of our Organization. We are aware that the Security Council is the primary body to determine its working methods, yet the Council does not operate in a vacuum. The way it functions has a clear impact on the substance of its work, and therefore on its relations with the other main organs of the United Nations.

We welcome the latest presidential note (S/2016/619) on the preparation of newly elected members and on the Chairs of the subsidiary organs. Nevertheless, I wish to highlight three points on other aspects of the working methods.

First, the most obvious and urgent issue in the working methods is the question of the veto. Needless to say, the Security Council has, on many occasions,

failed to act in a timely manner to find lasting solutions to problems. There is no accountability mechanism for inaction by the Council, which mostly results from the threat or the use of the veto. That inaction is the main factor that encourages those who do not refrain from breaching the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations in a consistent fashion. To preserve the credibility of the Organization and to enable it to fulfil the responsibility given by the Charter, we should deploy more resolute efforts.

In that respect, we welcome the initiative by France and Mexico, as well as that by Liechtenstein on behalf of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency Group, aimed at eliminating a negative vote in case of mass atrocities. However, the code of conduct regarding the non-permanent members will not be meaningful unless the permanent members embrace it too. In that context, let me also invite the Council to carefully reflect upon its recent inaction during the critical hours when its support and solidarity were important for my country, its people and democratic institutions.

Secondly, there is the relationship between the Council and the General Assembly. Bearing in mind the certain limits in that regard, we think that there is still room for improvement in terms of increasing the transparency and inclusiveness of the work of the Council. To that effect, more informative briefings and Arria Formula meetings; the timely availability of draft resolutions, presidential statements and information on the work of the subsidiary bodies; decreasing the frequency of closed meetings; and increased consultation with the members, including the troop- and police-contributing States, are needed for meaningful interaction. The process of the selection of the next Secretary-General is undergoing a positive change in terms of transparency, and there can be further improvements in that regard.

Finally, we would be pleased to see a more equitable division of labour among Council members.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Panama.

Ms. Flores Herrera (Panama) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, allow me to acknowledge the leadership of Japan in proposing this timely debate, 10 years after the approval of the first presidential note (S/2006/507) of the Council on working methods. Japan's renewed commitment to the issue allows the General Assembly to bring to the Council one aspect of the broader discussions we have conducted on Security Council reform, which should undoubtedly continue.

Panama aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Iran on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. We have the honour to add some considerations in our national capacity and from our experience as a non-permanent member of the Council on five occasions.

First, in the light of the various exchanges that have taken place in recent years in order to lend greater efficiency and effectiveness to the Security Council, Panama has repeatedly raised the issue that this forum needs to be revitalized, not just to be representative but also inclusive, transparent and increasingly open to accountability. There is an urgent need for improved and greater access to the Council's information and decision-making process; an increase in the frequency of consultations and open briefings and Arria Formula meetings, and thereby, greater interaction and coordination with the General Assembly, with a view to enabling the Council to reach a higher level of effectiveness in its working methods. The global dynamics and our membership have experienced permanent changes since 1946. Therefore, the internal structures and internal dynamics of the Organization need to be updated to respond effectively to the new realities — an update demanded by 97.4 per cent of the membership in order to feel represented.

Secondly, the Security Council needs more diverse and closer participation by non-member States, in particular developing countries and/or traditionally underrepresented regions. There is also a need to strengthen the role of the non-permanent members. Nevertheless, Panama emphasizes that the presidency of the Council and the chairmanships of the subsidiary bodies should be assigned solely to non-permanent members in order to create a balance in the performance of the membership.

As a member of the Group of Friends on the Responsibility to Protect, Panama stresses the importance of the reports prepared by the Special Advisers to the Secretary-General on the prevention of genocide and the responsibility to protect when it comes to early warning about situations where populations are at risk of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, as mentioned in the Secretary-General's Human Rights Up Front initiative. With that vision of a more democratic Security

Council, Panama has expressed its support for the code of conduct promoted by the Accountability Coherence and Transparency Group.

Thirdly, the ongoing process for the selection of the next Secretary-General must exhibit credibility and transparency. It should also highlight the attitude of a Council whose permanent membership is aware of the new realities and the aspirations of the majority they represent, and therefore aware that the central role of that process concerns the General Assembly.

In conclusion, our aspiration is that periodic changes resulting from the deliberations of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters translate beyond a new consolidated document and into effective action to strengthen a Council with open doors, a Council ethical in its decision-making and with a transparent and accountable attitude.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Portugal.

Mr. Mendonça e Moura (Portugal): I thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this open debate on the implementation of presidential note S/2010/507. The inclusion of this debate in the programme of work is a sign of Japan's commitment to the issue and to the efforts made by the Japanese delegation towards improving the Security Council's working methods. I wish to also express our recognition for the work recently undertaken by the members of the Council to move this agenda forward, in particular Angola as the previous Chair of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters, and Spain, which organized the productive debate on the implementation of note 507 in October 2015 (see S/PV.7539).

When the time comes to start the discussions to update note 507, we must acknowledge that positive developments have occurred since its adoption in 2010, prompted by an active commitment by Council members and the contribution and support of the wider membership, including that of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency Group, of which we are a part.

The Security Council working methods have proved to be a subject of interest to us all, and we appreciate the Security Council's efforts to continue to push it forward. Very recently, we had an example of such efforts in the form of the adoption of presidential note S/2016/619, under Japan's tenure, with concrete measures to facilitate the preparation by newly elected members of their mandates and the appointment of the new Chairs of the subsidiary bodies, aiming at improving the transparency, efficiency and inclusiveness in the Council.

In this vein and responding to your invitation, Mr. President, to make practical suggestions on the implementation of note 507, I would submit two concrete ones, both in view of increasing transparency:

The first has to do with making available to non-members of the Council draft resolutions and presidential statements as soon as they are introduced within informal consultations, or earlier. We think that this is an important element of transparency, already reflected in paragraph 44 of note 507, but where some further efforts concerning its implementation should be exerted as a matter of regular practice.

The second is the suggestion that at briefings members of the Council express publicly their views following the briefers' public statements. That would allow the members of the Council to put on record their views on the subject under consideration, which otherwise might be expressed only in informal consultations, of course notwithstanding the possibility of Council members convening subsequently in informal consultations on the same subject, whenever appropriate and if still necessary.

These are two concrete suggestions in view of the future updating of note 507. Let me conclude by expressing our full support for this initiative and by thanking you once again, Sir, for your commitment to improving the Security Council's working methods.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Lee Moon Hee (Republic of Korea): I would like to thank you, Sir, for organizing today's open debate on the working methods of the Security Council.

Bearing in mind the President's guidelines for today's debate, I would like to focus on, among others, three topics of particular interest to my delegation. These are related but not limited to sections IV, VI, VII, VIII and XI of the annex to S/2010/507.

First, efforts to improve the working methods of the Security Council should be undertaken with a view to enhancing the Council's transparency, accountability,

legitimacy, and efficiency. From the ongoing situations in Syria, Iraq and South Sudan to nuclear threat of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and emerging threats of violent extremism, the decisions of the Security Council must be respected and faithfully implemented in accordance with the Charter. To that end, we need the spontaneity of the entire membership. The paragraphs of note 507, especially those encouraging active interactions between the Council and the broader membership, such as paragraphs 42 to 45, could be better utilized in that regard. The Council could boost the legitimacy of its actions with more public meetings in lieu of the current practice of holding informal consultations. Paragraphs 28 and 31 of note 507 are of particular relevance in that context.

Secondly, the working methods of the subsidiary bodies must be improved. The level of the effectiveness of sanctions committees is directly related to the authority of the Security Council's sanctions regime. No resolution of the Council can be expected to be adhered to if the Council shows little interest in effectively implementing its decision through its own subsidiary body. Even resolution 2270 (2017) — imposing one of the most comprehensive and robust sanctions regime ever to be adopted by the Council — must be faithfully implemented if it is to accomplish its goals. By refining paragraphs 46 through 50 of note 507, the Council could further solidify the working methods of its subsidiary bodies.

In addition, the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations can be instrumental in strengthening the credibility of Security Council decisions by contributing to greater support for the mandates of various peacekeeping missions. We have to remember that the Report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (see S/2015/446) and the subsequent report of the Secretary-General also recommended the revitalization of the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations.

Thirdly, better coordination with other relevant bodies of the United Nations system, such as the Peacebuidling Commission (PBC) and the Economic and Social Council, should be promoted. My delegation made the same point at the open debate on working methods held in October 2015 (see S/PV.7539). As we are all aware, the adoption of resolution 2282 (2016) was a landmark achievement not only of the Council, but of the United Nations membership in general. The Republic of Korea, as a current member of both the Economic and Social Council and the PBC, is committed to working closely with other Member States in following through with its implementation.

In this regard, my delegation appreciates the initiative of Egypt, as a designated coordinator on the stocktaking exercise on the PBC's advisory function to the Security Council, to convene a meeting on 14 April. A number of useful points were raised and discussed, including the need for closer coordination in terms of the sequence and the content of messaging and the potential of dispatching PBC field visits to complement the Security Council's fact-finding missions. On this point, my delegation suggests that we incorporate how PBC's field visits can better complement the Security Council's field missions by updating relevant paragraphs of note 507, namely, paragraphs 66 through 69.

Finally, I wish to express my delegation's appreciation once again to all members of the Security Council that have organized previous open debates on working methods for their tireless efforts to make the much-needed change in how the Council conducts its day-to-day operations, one step at a time. My delegation will continue working with them in the process.

The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.